240-1
7 (XV)

Gallery
(below Camden Series,
bottom shelves.)

HISTORY OF THE POPES

VOL. XV

PASTOR'S HISTORY OF THE POPES

THE HISTORY OF THE POPES. Translated from the German of LUDWIG, FREIHERR VON PASTOR. Edited, as to Vols. I.-VI., by the late FREDERICK IGNATIUS ANTROBUS, and, as to Vols. VII.-XVI., by RALPH FRANCIS KERR, of the London Oratory. In 16 Volumes.

Vols. I. and II.	A.D. 1305-1458
Vols. III. and IV.	A.D. 1458-1483
Vols. V. and VI.	A.D. 1484-1513
Vols. VII. and VIII.	A.D. 1513-1521
Vols. IX. and X.	A.D. 1522-1534
Vols. XI. and XII.	A.D. 1534-1549
Vols. XIII. and XIV.	A.D. 1550-1559
Vols. XV. and XVI.	A.D. 1559-1565

THE
HISTORY OF THE POPES,

FROM THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES

DRAWN FROM THE SECRET ARCHIVES OF THE VATICAN AND OTHER
ORIGINAL SOURCES

FROM THE GERMAN OF

LUDWIG, FREIHERR VON PASTOR

EDITED BY

RALPH FRANCIS KERR

OF THE LONDON ORATORY

VOLUME XV

PIUS IV. (1559-1565)

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER & CO., LTD.
BROADWAY HOUSE: 68-74 CARTER LANE, E.C.
1928

DEDICATED
TO HIS DEAR FRIEND
STEPHEN EHSES
PRELATE, DR. PHIL. ET THEOL.
DIRECTOR OF THE ROMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE OF THE
"GÖRRES-GESELLSCHAFT"
WITH SINCERE ESTEEM
BY
THE AUTHOR

Fluctuare potest, demergi nequaquam [*Ecclesia*].
Pius IV. to Girolamo Priuli, Doge of Venice, December 30th, 1560.
(Papal Secret Archives. Arm. 44, t. 10, n. 420).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE DEVONSHIRE PRESS, TORQUAY

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV.

PAGE
Collections of Archives and Manuscripts referred to in Volumes XV. and XVI. vii
Complete Titles of Books frequently quoted in Volumes XV. and XVI. ix
Table of Contents xxv
List of Unpublished Documents in Appendix . . xxxvi

Pius IV, 1559–1565

Author's Preface xxxvii
Introduction xxxix
The Conclave of 1559 1
Previous Life and Character of Pius IV. The beginning of his Pontificate 66
The Pope's Relatives. Charles Borromeo. Diplomatic Relations with the Princes 94
The Fall of the House of Carafa . . . 131
Negotiations for the re-opening of the Council of Trent . 179
The Mission of Commendone and Delfino to Germany . 216
Final preparations for the re-opening of the Council . 241
Re-opening of the Council of Trent. Sessions XVII. to XXII. 264
The Mission of Morone to Ferdinand I. at Innsbruck, 1562–1563 299
Concluding Sessions of the Council of Trent . . 328
Significance of the Council of Trent . . . 366
Appendix of Unpublished Documents . . . 379
Index of Names 431

COLLECTIONS OF ARCHIVES AND MANUSCRIPTS REFERRED TO IN VOLUMES XV. AND XVI.

AREZZO—Library of the *Confraternità di S. Maria.*
AUXERRE—Library.

BASLE—Library.
BERLIN—State (formerly *Royal*) Library.
BOLOGNA—State Archives.
——— University Library.
BREGENZ—Museum Archives.

CARPENTRAS—Library.
CARLSRUHE—Library.
CITTÀ DI CASTELLO—Graziani Archives.
COLMAR—State Library.
COMO—Serbelloni-Busca Archives.
CORTONA—Library.

FAENZA—Communal Archives.
FLORENCE—National Library.
——— State Archives.
FOLIGNO—Seminary Library.

GALLESE—Altemps Archives.
GENOA—University Library.

HOHENEMS—Archives of the Hohenems family (Waldburg-Zeil).

INNSBRUCK—Vice-regal Archives.
——— University Library.

LONDON—British Museum.

MANTUA—Episcopal Archives.
——— Gonzaga Archives.
MILAN—Ambrosian Library.
——— Trivulziana Library.
MODENA—State Archives.
MONTPELLIER—Library.
MUNICH—State Library.

NAPLES—State Archives.
——— Brancacciana Library.
——— National Library.
——— Oratorian Library.
——— Library of the *Società di storia patria.*

OSSEGG—Convent Library.

PARIS—Archives of *Affaires étrangères.*
——— National Archives.
——— National Library.
PARMA—Palatine Library.
PISTOIA—Forteguerri Library.
PRAGUE—Nostitz Library.

ROME—
(a) *Archives:*
the Boncompagni.
the Colonna.
the Fabbrica di S. Pietro.
the Spanish Embassy.
Consistorial[1], of the Vatican.
the Papal Secret (Secret Archives of the Vatican)
of the State.

---

[1] Under Pius X. included in the Papal Secret Archives.

(b) *Libraries :*
- Altieri.
- Casanatense.
- Chigi.
- Corsini.
- Vallicelliana.
- Vatican.
- Vittorio Emanuele.

SAN SEVERINO (The Marches)—Communal Library.
SIMANCAS—Archives.

STOCKHOLM—Library.

UPSALA—Library.

VENICE—State Archives.
——— Library of St. Mark.
VIENNA—State Archives.
——— Court Library.
——— Liechtenstein Library.
——— Rossiana Library.
VITERBO—Chapter Library.
VOLTERRA—Guarnacci Library.

COMPLETE TITLES OF BOOKS QUOTED IN VOLUMES XV. AND XVI.

Albèri, E. Le relazioni degli ambasciatori Veneti al durante il secolo decimosesto. 3 series. Firenze, 1839-1855.

Alessandri, P. d'. Atti di San Carlo riguardanti la Svizzera e suoi territorii nei processi di canonizzazione. Locarno, 1909.

Amabile, L. Il. S. Officio della Inquisizione in Napoli. Vol. I., Città di Castello, 1892.

Ambros, A. W. Geschichte der Musik. Vol. II., III., 3rd ed.; Vol.. IV., 2nd ed., Leipzig, 1881-1893.

Ancel, R. La secrétairerie sous Paul IV. Paris, 1906.

——— Le Vatican sous Paul IV. Contribution à l'histoire du palais pontifical. Rev. Bénédictine, Jan., 1908, pp. 48–71.

——— La disgrâce et le procès des Carafas d'après des documents inédits 1559 à 1557. Maredsous, 1909.

——— Nonciatures de France. Nonciatures de Paul IV. (with the last years of Julius III. and Marcellus II.). Vol. I., Nonciatures de Sebastiano Gualterio et de Cesare Brancatio (Mai 1554–Juillet 1557), 1re et 2me partie; Paris, 1909, 1911.

Anquetil. L'esprit de la Ligue ou histoire politique des troubles de France pendant le XVI.e et XVII.e siècle. Nouv. edit., Vol. I. Paris, 1818.

Archivio della Società Romana di storia patria. Vols. I. *et seqq.* Roma, 1878 *seqq.*

Archivio storico dell'Arte, publ. par *Gnoli.* Vols. I. *et seqq.* Roma, 1888 *seqq.*

Archivio storico Italiano. 5 series. Firenze, 1842 *seqq.*

Archivio storico Lombardo. Vols. I. *et seqq.* Milano, 1874 *seqq*

Archivio storico per le provincie Napolitane. Vols. I. *et seqq.* Napoli, 1876 *seqq.*

Aretin, C. M., Freiherr V. Bayerns auswärtige Verhältnisse seit dem Anfang des 16 Jahrhunderts. Vol. I. Passau, 1839.

Armand, A. Les Médailleurs Italiens des XV.e et XVI.e siècles. Vols. II., III. Paris, 1883, 1887.

Armellini, M. Le chiese di Roma dalle loro origini sino al secolo XVI. Roma, 1887.

Arte, L'. Continuation of the *Archivio storico dell 'Arte.* Roma, 1898 *seqq.*

Astrain, A., S.J. Historia de la Compañia de Jesus en la Asistencia de España. Vols. I., II. Madrid, 1902, 1905.

Atti e Memorie della r. deputaz. di storia patria per la prov. dell' Emilia. Prima serie 1–8; Nuova Serie, 1 *seqq.* Modena, 1863 *seqq.*

Aumale, Duc d'. Histoire des Princes de Condé. 8 vols. Paris, 1869–1895.

Baguenault de Puchesse, G. Jean de Morvillier, évêque d'Orléans. Paris, 1870.

Balan, P. Storia d'Italia. 6 vols. Modena, 1882.

Baluze, S. Miscellanea ; ed. *Mansi.* 4 vols. Lucca, 1761.

Baraccomi, G. J. Rioni di Roma. Terza ristampa. Torino-Roma, 1905.

Bartoli, A. Cento Vedute di Roma antica. Firenze, 1911.

Bartoli, D. Dell' Istoria della Compagnia di Gesù. L'Italia, prima parte dell'Europa. Libro primo e secondo (Opere, Vol. 5). Torino, 1825.

Bascapè (*Carolus a Basilicapetri*). De vita et rebus gestis Caroli S.R.E. Cardinalis tituli S. Praxedis archiepiscopi Mediolanensis libri septem. Brixiæ, 1602. (Used for the version given in the *Acta ecclesiæ Mediolan.* 3 vols., Brixiæ, 1603).

Baschet, A. La Diplomatie Vénétienne. Les princes de l'Europe au XVI.e siècle . . . d'après les rapports des ambassadeurs Vénétiens. Paris, 1862.

Baum, A. Theodor Beza. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1843, 1851.

Bäumer, S. Geschichte des Breviers. Freiburg, 1895.

Baumgartner, A. Geschichte der Weltliteratur. Vol. VI. : Die italienische Literatur. Frieburg, 1911.

Bäumker, W. Palestrina. Freiburg, 1877 (a contribution to the history of the reform of Church music in Italy in the 16th century).

Beccadelli, L. Monumenti di varia letteratura, tratti dai Manoscritti di Msgr. L. B., ed. *Morandi.* Bologna, 1797–1804.

Beccari, C., S.J. Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores occidentales inediti saeculo XVI. ad XIX. Vols. V. and X. Romæ, 1907, 1910.

Bieträge zur Geschichte Herzog Albrechts V. und der sog. Adelsverschwörung von 1563. By *Walter Goetz* and *Leonhard Theobald.* (Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des 16 Jahrhunderts mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Bayerns Fürstenhaus. Vol. VI.). Leipzig, 1913.

Bekker, Ernst. Maria Stuart, Darnley, Bothwell. (Giessener Studien aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte, Vol. I.). Giessen, 1881.

——— Elisabeth und Leicester, 1560–1562. Giessen, 1890.

Bellesheim, A. Geschichte der katolischen Kirche in Schottland von der Einführung des Christentums bis auf die Gegenwart. Vol. II., 1560–1878. Mainz, 1883.

——— Wilhelm Kardinal Allen (1532–1594) und die englischen Seminare auf dem Festlande. Mainz, 1885.

——— Geschichte der katolischen Kirche in Irland. Vol. II., 1509-1690. Mainz, 1890.

Benigni, U. Die Getreidpolitik der Päpste. Ed. *G. Ruhland.* Berlin, 1898.

Benrath, K. Die Reformation in Venedig. Halle, 1887.

Berliner, A. Geschichte der Juden in Rom von den ältesten zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. 2 vols. Frankfurt a. M., 1893.

Bertolotti, A. Artisti Lombardi a Roma nei secoli XV., XVI. e XVII. Studi e ricerche negli archivi Romani. 2 vols. Milano, 1881.

——— Artisti Bolognesi, Ferraresi ed alcuni altri in Roma. Bologna, 1885.

——— Artisti subalpini in Roma. Mantova, 1885.

——— Martiri del libero pensiero e vittime della santa Inquisizione nei secoli XVI., XVII., e XVIII. Roma, 1891.

Biaudet, H. Les nonciatures apostoliques permanentes jusqu'en 1648 (Annales Academiæ scientiarum Fennicæ. Series B., Vol. II., 1). Helsinki, 1910.

Bicci, Marco Ubaldo, Notizia della famiglia Boccapaduli patrizia Romana. Roma, 1762.

Bobadilla, Nic. Alph. de, Gesta et scripta (Monum. hist. Soc. Jesu). Matriti, 1913.

Boero, G. Vita del P. G. Lainez. Firenze, 1880.

Bonanni, Ph. Numismata Pontificum Romanorum. Vol. II. Roma, 1699.

Bondonus, Lud., de Branchis Firmanus. Diaria Caerimonialia: *Merkle,* Conc. Trid. II., Frib. Brisg., 1911, pp. 518–571.

Borgatti, M. Castel di S. Angelo in Roma. Roma, 1890.

Borgia, Sanctus Franciscus, quartus Gandiæ dux et Societatis Jesu præpositus generalis tertius (Monum. hist. Soc. Jesu). Vols. IV., V. (1565–1572). Matriti, 1910, 1911.

Brosch, M. Geschichte des Kirchenstaates. Vol. I., Gotha, 1880.

——— Geschichte Englands. Vol. VI., Gotha, 1890.

Brown, Rawdon, Calendar of State Papers relating to English affairs (Venice and North Italy). Vols. VI., VII. London, 1873–1890.

Bucholtz, F. B. Geschichte der Regierung Ferdinands I. 9 vols. Vienna, 1831–1838.

Bullarium Diplomatum et Privilegiorum Summorum Romanorum Pontificum. Taurinensis editio. Vol. VI. Aug. Taurin., 1860; Vol. VII. Neapoli, 1882.

Burckhardt, J. Geschichte der Renaissance in Italien. 5th Ed., Esslinger, 1912.

——— Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien. 2 vols., 10th Ed. by *L. Geiger.* Leipzig, 1908.

Burnet, G. The History of the Reformation. 7 vols. London, 1865.

Buschbell, G. Reformation und Inquisition in Italien um die Mitte des 16 Jahrhunderts. Paderborn, 1910.

Calenzio, G. Documenti inediti e nuovi lavori letterarii sul Concilio di Trento. Roma, 1874.

Cambridge Modern History. Vol. III. The Wars of Religion. Cambridge, 1904.

Cancellieri, F. Storia dei solenni Possessi dei Sommi Pontefici. Roma, 1802.

Canisii, Beati Petri, Epistulæ et Acta. Collegit, etc. *O. Braunsberger, S.J.* Vols. I.–V. Frib. Brisg., 1896–1910.

Cantù, G. Gli Eretici d'Italia. 3 vols. Torino, 1864–1866.

Carceveri, L. Giovanni Grimani Patriarca d'Aquileia imputato di eresia e assolto dal Concilio di Trento. Roma, 1907.

Cardella, L. Memorie storiche de'cardinali della S. Romana chiesa. Vol. V. Roma, 1793.

Caro, A. Lettere colla vita dell' autore scritta da *A. F. Seghezzi.* 3 vols. Milano, 1807.

Caruso, Giambatt. Discorso istorico-apologetico della Monarchia di Sicilia pp. *G. M. Mira.* Palermo, 1863.

Cecchetti, B. La repubblica di Venezia e la corte di Roma nei rapporti della religione. 2 vols. Venezia, 1874.

Charrière, E. Négociations de la France dans le Levant. (Collect. des docum. inéd. pour l'hist. de France, Vols. I., II.). Paris, 1848.

Chattard, G. P. Nuova descrizione del Vaticano. Vols. I.–III. Roma, 1762-1767.

Ciaconius, Alph. Vita et res gestæ Pont. Romanorum et S. R. E. Cardinalium . . . ab A. Oldoino (S.J.) recognita. Vol. III. Romæ, 1677.

Cibrario, L. Lettere di Santi, Papi, Principi, etc. Torino, 1861.

Clementi, F. Il Carnevale Romano nelle cronache contemporanee. Roma, 1899.

Conclavi de' Pontefici Romani. s.l., 1667.

Condivi, A. Das Leben des Michelangelo Buonarroti. Vienna, 1874.

Constant, G. Rapport sur une mission scientifique aux archives d'Autriche et d'Espagne. (Nouv. Arch. des Missions scientif. et littér. Vol. XVIII.). Paris, 1910.

Contarini, N. Antichità di Roma. Venezia, 1569.

Coppi, A. Discorso sopra le finanze di Roma nei secoli di mezzo. Roma, 1847.

Corpo diplomatico Portuguez . . . desde o seculo XVI., pp. *L. A. Rebello da Silva,* Vols. VIII., IX. Lisbon, 1886 *seq.*

Correspondance de Babou de la Bourdaisière, évêque d'Angoulême. Reims, 1859.

Correspondance du cardinal Granvelle ; publ. p. *Poullet et Piot.* 12 vols. Bruxelles, 1878-1896.

Correspondencia de Felipe II. con sus embajadores en la Corte de Inglaterra 1558 à 1584. Vols. IV., V. (Colección de documentos inéditos para la historia de España, Vols. 91, 92). Madrid, 1888.

Correspondencia diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede durante el pontificado de s. Pio V. por *D. L. Serrano.* 3 vols. Roma, 1914.

Cramer, L. La Seigneurie de Genève et la maison de Savoie de 1559 à 1603. 2 vols. Genève, 1912.

Cupis, C. de. Le vicende dell'agricoltura e della pastorizia nell'agro Romano e l'Annona di Roma. Roma, 1911.

Cyprianus, E. Tabularium ecclesiæ Romanæ sæculi decimi sexti, in quo monumenta restituti calicis Eucharistici totiusque concilii Tridentini historiam mirifice illustrantia continentur. Francofurti et Lipsiæ, 1743.

Daelli, G. Carte Michelangiolesche inedite. Milano, 1885.

Degert, A. Procès de huit évêques français suspects de Calvinisme : Rev. des quest. hist., Vol. 76, Paris, 1904, pp. 61–108.

Dejob. L'influence du Concile de Trente sur la littérature et les beaux-arts. Paris, 1884.

Dembiński, B. Wybór Piusa IV. Abhandlungen der Krakauer Akademie, Vol. XX., Krakau, 1887, pp. 190-304.

——— Rzym i Europa przed rozpoczciem trzeciego okresu soboru trydenckiego. Kraków, 1891.

Dengel, J. Geschichte des Palazzo di S. Marco. Leipzig, 1909.

Desjardins, A. Négociations diplomatiques de la France avec la Toscane. Doc. recueillis par *G. Canestrini.* Vols. I. *seqq.* Paris, 1859 *seqq.*

Dierauer, J. Geschichte der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft. Vol. III., 1516–1648. Gotha, 1907.

Dispacci di Germania : Ed. by the Histor. Kommission der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vols. I.–III., ed. by *Turba.* Vienna, 1889–1895.

Döllinger, J. J. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. 2 vols Regensburg, 1843.

——— Kirche und Kirchen. München, 1861.

——— Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen, und Kulturgeschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte. Vols. II., III. Regensburg, 1863–1882.

——— Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebücher zur Geshichte des Konzils von Trient. 2 vols. Nördlingen, 1876.

Duhr, B., S.J. Jesuitenfabeln. Freiburg, 1904.

——— Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern deutscher Zunge im 16 Jahrh. Vol. I. Freiburg, 1907.

Duruy, G. Le Cardinal Carlo Carafa (1519–1561). Paris, 1882.

Eder, G. Die Reformvorschläge Kaiser Ferdinands I. auf dem Konzil von Trient. Münster, 1911.

Egger, H. Römische Veduten. Vienna and Leipzig, 1911.

Ehrenberg, H. Urkunden und Aktenstücke zur Geschichte der in der heutigen Provinz Posen vereinigten ehemals polnischen Landesteile. Leipzig, 1892.

Ehrle, F., S.J. Roma prima di Sisto V. La pianta di Roma Du Pérac-Lafréry del, 1577. Roma, 1908.

Ehses, S. Concilium Tridentinum. Vols. IV., V., VIII. Frib. Brisg. 1904–1919.

——— Die letzte Berufung des Trienter Konzils durch Pius IV., 29 November, 1560. Kempten, 1913.

——— Der Schlussakt des Konzils von Trient. Köln, 1914.

——— Ein päpstlicher Nuntius am Rhein vor 350 Jahren : Vorträge und Abhandlungen der Görres-Gesellschaft zur Pflege der Wissenschaft im Kathol. Deutschland. Köln, 1917, pp. 39–44.

Eichhorn, A. Der ermländische Bischof und Kardinal Stanislaus Hosius. 2 vols. Mainz, 1854–1855.

Eisler, Alex. Das Veto der katholischen Staaten bei der Papstwahl. Vienna, 1907.

Elkan, A. Philipp Marnix von St. Adelgonde. Leipzig, 1910–1911.

Epistolæ PP. Paschasii Broeti, Claudii Jaji, Joannis Codurii et Simonis Rodericii Soc. Jesu. Matriti, 1903.
Epistolæ P. Alphonsi Salmeronis Soc. Jesu, nunc primum editæ. Vols. I., II. (1536–1585). Matriti, 1906–1907.
Escher, Konrad, Barock und Klassizismus. Leipzig [1910].

Fantuzzi, Giov. Notizie degli Scrittori Bolognesi. 9 vols. Bologna, 1781–1794.
Flamini, F. Il Cinquecento (Storia lett. d'Italia). Milano [1903].
Fleming, David Hay. Mary Queen of Scots from her Birth to her Flight into England. London, 1897.
Fontana, B. Renata di Francia, duchessa di Ferrara. 3 vols. Roma, 1889-1894.
Forbes-Leith, W., S.J. Narratives of Scottish Catholics under Mary Stuart and James VI. Edinburgh, 1885.
Forcella, V. Iscrizioni delle chiese e d'altri edifici di Roma dal secolo XI. fino ai giorni nostri. 14 vols. Roma, 1869–1885.
Forneron, H. Histoire de Philippe II. Vol. I. Paris, 1881.
Fouqueray, H. Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France. Vol. I. (1528–1575). Paris, 1910.
Frere, W. H. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. London, 1904.
Friedberg, E. Die Grenzen zwischen Staat und Kirche und die Garantien gegen deren Verletzung. Tübingen, 1872
Friedländer, W. Das Casino Pius IV. Leipzig, 1912.

Gachard, L. P. Correspondance de Philippe II. sur les affaires des Pays-Bas. Vol. I. Bruxelles, 1848.
——— Correspondance de Marguerite d'Autriche, duchesse de Parme, avec Philippe II. Vol. I. Bruxelles, 1867.
Gams, P. B. Die Kirchengeschichte von Spanien. 3 vols., 2nd ed. Regensburg, 1879.
Gamucci, B., di S. Gimignano. Le antichità della città di Roma. 2 ediz. corr. da *T. Porcacchi.* Venetia, 1569.
Garampi, G. Saggi di osservazioni sul valore delle antiche monete pontificie. Con appendice di documenti. S.l.et a. [Roma, 1766].
Gatticus, J. B. Acta cæremonialia S. Romanæ Ecclesiæ ex MSS. codicibus. Vol. I. Romæ, 1753.
Gaudentius, P. Beiträge zur Kirchengeschichte des 16 und 17 Jahrh. Bedeutung und Verdienste des Franziskaner-Ordens im Kampfe gegen den Protestantismus. Vol. I. Bozen, 1880.
Gaye, E. G. Carteggio inedito d'artisti dei secoli XV., XVI. e XVII. 3 vols. Firenze, 1840.
Geymüller, H. von. Michelangelo Buonarroti als Architekt. München, 1904.
Giannone, P. Istoria civile del regno di Napoli. Ediz. accresciuta di note critiche, etc. Vol. IV. Venezia, 1766.
Giornale Storico della letteratura Italiana. Vols. I. *seqq.* Roma–Torino–Firenze, 1883 *seqq.*
Giuliani. Trento al tempo del Concilio. Trento, 1888.

Giussano, G. P. Vita di S. Carlo Borromeo. Roma, 1610.

Göller, Emil. Die päpstliche Pönitentiarie von ihrem Ursprung bis zu ihrer Umgestaltung unter Pius V. 2 vols. Rome, 1907, 1911.

Gori, F. Archivio storico, artistico, archeologico e letterario della città e provincia di Roma. Vols. I.–IV. Roma e Spoleto, 1875–1883.

Gothein, E. Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation. Halle, 1895.

Gothein, M. Geschichte der Gartenkunst. Vol. I. Jena, 1914.

Gotti, A. Vita di Michelangelo Buonarotti narrata con l'aiuto di nuovi documenti. 2 vols. Firenze, 1875.

Götz, W. Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des 16 Jahrhunderts. Vol. V., Beiträge zur Geschichte Herzogs Albrechts V. und des Landsberger Bundes, 1556–1598. München, 1898.

Grimm, H. Leben Michelangelos. 2 vols. 5th ed. Berlin, 1879.

Grisar, H. Die Frage des päpstlichen Primates und des Ursprungs der bischöflichen Gewalt auf dem Tridentinum: Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie, 1884, Innsbruck, pp. 453 *seq.*, 727 *seq.*

——— Jacobi Lainez disputationes Tridentinæ. 2 vols. Oeniponte, 1884.

Guettée. Histoire de l'Eglise de France. Vol. VIII. Paris, 1853.

Guglielmotti, Alb. La guerra dei pirati dal 1500 al 1560. 2 vols. Firenze, 1876.

——— Storia delle fortificazioni nella spiaggia Romana. Roma, 1880.

Guhl, E. Künstlerbriefe. Vol. I. Berlin, 1880.

Guidus, Ant. De obitu Pauli IV. et conclavi cum electione Pii IV.: *Merkle,* Conc. Trid. II., Frib. Brisg., 1911, pp. 605–632.

Guillemin, J. J. Le cardinal [Charles] de Lorraine, son influence politique et religieuse au 16e siècle. [Reims], 1847.

Gulik-Eubel. Hierarchia Catholica medii ævi. Vol. III. Monasterii, 1910.

Hammer, J. von. Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches... Vol. III. Pest, 1828.

Hansen, J. Rheinische Akten zur Geschichte des Jesuitenordens, 1542–1582. Bonn, 1896.

Hauser, H. Les sources de l'histoire de France. Vol. II., Paris, 1909.

Heidenhain, A. Die Unionspolitik Landgraf Philipps von Hessen 1557–1562. Halle, 1890.

Helle, Ph. Die Conferenzen Morones mit Kaiser Ferdinand I. (Mai, 1563) und ihre Einwirkung auf den Gang des Trienter Konzils. Bonn, 1911.

Henner, K. Beiträge zur Organisation und Kompetenz der päpstlichen Ketzergerichte. Leipzig, 1890.

Henry, P. Das Leben Johann Calvins. 3 vols. Hamburg, 1835–1844.

Hergenröther, J. Katholische Kirche und christlicher Staat. Freiburg, 1872.

Herre, P. Papsttum und Papstwahl in Zeitalter Philipps II. Leipzig, 1907.

Hilgers, J., S.J. Der Index der verbotenen Bücher. Freiburg, 1904.
Hilliger, B. Die wahl Pius' V. zum Papste. Leipzig, 1891.
——— Katharina von Medici und die Zusammenkunst zu Bayonne (1565): Historisches Taschenbuch, 6th series, Vol. XI. Leipzig, 1892, pp. 239–317.
Hinojosa, R. de. Felipe II. y el conclave de 1559. Madrid, 1889.
——— Los despachos de la diplomacia pontificia en España. Vol. I. Madrid, 1896.
Hinschius, P. System des katholischen Kirchenrechts. Berlin, 1869.
Hirn, J. Erzherzog Ferdinand II. von Tirol. Geschichte seiner Regierung und seiner Länder. Vols. I., II. Innsbruck, 1885, 1887.
Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland. Vols. 1–164. München, 1838–1919.
Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft. Vols. 1–39. Münster und München, 1880–1919.
Holtzmann, R. Kaiser Maximilian II. bis zu seiner Thronbesteigung. Berlin, 1903.
Hosack, John. Mary Queen of Scots and her Accusers [1542–1570]. Edinburgh, 1869.
Huber, A. Geschichte Oesterreichs. Vol. IV. Gotha, 1892.
Hubert, F. Vergerios publizistische Tätigkeit. Göttingen, 1893.
Hübner, A. von. Papst Sixtus der Fünfte. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1871.
Hume, M.A.S. Calendar of Letters, Despatches and State Papers . . . England and Spain. Vol. I. (1558–1567). London, 1892.

Janssen, J. Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Vols. I.–III., 19th and 20th ed. Freiburg, 1913–1917.
Jorga, N. Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches. Vol. III. Gotha, 1910.

Karttunen, L. Antonio Possevino. Lausanne, 1908.
Kassowitz, J. B. Die Reformvorschläge Kaiser Ferdinands I. auf dem Konzil von Trient. Vienna, 1906.
Katholik, Der. Zeitschrift für kathol. Wissenschaft und Kirchliches Leben. Vols. I. *seqq.* Strassburg and Mainz, 1820–1919.
Kervyn de Lettenhove. Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre. Vols. II.–IV. (1559–1567). Bruxelles, 1883–1885.
Kirchenlexikon oder Enzyklopädie der kathol. Theologie und ihrer Hilfswissenschaften. By *H. J. Wetzer* and *B. Welte.* 2nd ed. 12 vols. Freiburg, 1882–1901.
Kluckhohn, A. Briefe Friedrichs des Frommen, Kurfürsten von der Pfalz (1559–1576). 2 vols. Braunschweig, 1868–1872.
Knöpfler, A. Die Kelchbewegung in Bayern unter Herzog Albrecht V. München, 1891.

Korzeniowski, J. Excerpta ex libris manuscriptis Archivii Consist. Romani MCCCCIX–MDXC . . . collecta. Cracoviæ, 1890.
Kraus, F. X. Geschichte der christlichen Kunst. 2 vols. 2nd ed. by *J. Sauer.* Freiburg, 1908.
Kretzschmar, Joh. Die Invasionsprojekte der katholischen Mächte gegen England zur zeit Elisabeths. Leipzig, 1892.
Kröss, J. Kaiser Ferdinand I. und seine Reformationsvorschläge auf dem Konzil von Trient: Zeitschrift für kathol. Theologie, 1903, Innsbruck, pp. 455 *seqq.*, 621 *seqq.*
Krutli, J. K. Die Eidgenössischen Abschiede, aus dem Zeitraume von 1556 bis 1586. Der amtlichen Abschiedesammlung, Vol. IV., part 2. Bern, 1861.

Labanoff, Prince Alex. Lettres, Instructions et Mémoires de Marie Stuart. Vols. I.–VII. London, 1844 *seqq.*
Lacomblet, Th. J. Urkundenbuch für die Geschichte des Niederrheins. Vol. IV. Düsseldorf, 1858.
Laderchi, J. Annales Ecclesiastici. Vols. 35-37. Bari Ducis, 1881–1883.
Lagomarsini, see *Pogiani.*
Laemmer, H. Zur Kirchengeschichte des 16 und 17 Jahrhunderts. Freiburg, 1863.
——— Meletematum Romanorum mantissa. Ratisbonæ, 1875,
Lanciani, R. Storia degli scavi di Roma. Vols. I.–IV. Roma, 1902–1910.
——— The golden Days of the Renaissance in Rome. London, 1907.
Lauchert, F. Die italienischen literarischen Gegner Luthers. Freiburg, 1912.
Laugwitz, Bartholomäus Carranza, erzbischof von Toledo. Kempton, 1870.
Lavisse, E. Histoire de France. Tome VI. Paris, 1904.
Le Bret, J. F. Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig. Riga, 1775.
Legazioni di A. Serristori, ambasciatore di Cosimo I. a Carlo V. e in corte di Roma con note di G. Canestrini. Firenze, 1853.
Le Plat, J. Monument. ad hist. Concilii Tridentini. 7 vols. Lovanii, 1781–1787.
Letarouilly, P. Le Vatican et la basilique de St. Pierre de Rome. Paris, 1878–1882.
Lettere de' principi. 3 vols., 3rd ed. Venezia, 1570–1577.
Lettres de Catherine de Médicis, publ. par *La Ferrière et Baguenault de Puchesse.* Vol. IV. Paris, 1891.
Leva, G. de. Giovanni Grimani Patriarca d'Aquileja (Atti del R. Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti: 5th Series, Vol. 7). Venezia, 1881.
Lingard, John. A History of England. Vols. VII., VIII. London, 1838.
Literarische Rundschau . . . Aachen-Freiburg, 1875 *seqq.*
Litta, P. Famiglie celebri Italiane. Disp. 1–183. Milano e Torino, 1819–1881.
Lossen, see *Masius.*

Löwe. Die Stellung des Kaisers Ferdinand I. zum Trienter Konzil vom Oktober 1561 bis Mai 1562. Bonn, 1887.

Mackowsky, H. Michelanjolo. Berlin, 1908.

Maffei. Vita di S. Pio V. Roma, 1712.

Manareus, O., S.J. De rebus Societatis Jesu commentarius. Florentiæ, 1886 (privately printed).

Manfroni, C. Storia della Marina Italiana dalla caduta di Constantinopoli alla battaglia di Lepanto. Roma, 1897.

Manutius, P. Epistolæ. Venetiis, 1573.

Marcks, E. Die Zusammenkunst von Bayonne. Das französiche Staatsleben und Spanien in den Jahren, 1563–1567. Strassburg, 1889.

——— Gaspard von Coligny. Vol. I. Stuttgart, 1892.

Marini, G. Degli archiatri pontifici. Vols. I., II. Roma, 1748.

Martène et Durand. Veterum scriptorum . . . collectio. 9 vols. Paris, 1724 *seqq.*

Masius, Andreas. Briefe des A. M. und seiner Freunde (1538–1573), ed. by *Lossen.* Leipzig, 1886.

Massarelli, A. Diarium septimum, ed. *Merkle,* Concil. Trid. II. Frib. Brisg., 1911, pp. 245–363.

Maurenbrecher, W. Archivalische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Jahres 1563. Leipzig, 1889.

Mayer, J. G. Das Konzil von Trient und die Gegenreformation in der Schweiz. 2 vols. Stans, 1901, 1903.

Mazzuchelli, G. M. Gli scrittori d' Italia. 2 vols. Brescia, 1753 *seq.*

Meaux, de. Les Luttes religieuses en France au XVI.e siècle. Paris, 1879.

Meister, A. Die Geheimschrift im Dienste der päpstlichen Kurie von ihren Anfängen bis zum Ende des 16 Jahrh. (Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiete der Geschichte, Vol. XI.). Paderborn, 1906.

Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire (Ecole française de Rome). Vols. I. *seqq.*, Paris, 1881 *seqq.*

Mendoça, Pedro Gonçalez de. Lo sucedido en el concilio de Trento : ed. *Merkle,* Conc. Trid. II. Frib. Brisg, 1911, pp. 633–721.

Mergentheim, Leo. Die Quinquennalfakultäten "pro foro externo." 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1908.

Merki, Ch. L'amiral de Coligny : La maison de Châtillon et la révolte protestante, 1519–1572. Paris, 1909.

Merkle, S. Concilii Tridentini Diariorum, Pars I. et II. Frib. Brisg., 1901, 1911.

Merlet, L. Le Cardinal de Châtillon. Paris, 1884.

Meyer, A. O. England und die katholische Kirche unter Elisabeth. Rome, 1911. [English transl. by J. R. McKee (cong. orat.)].

Mignet. Histoire de Marie Stuart. Vols. I.., II. Paris, 1851.

Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung. Vols. I., *seqq.* Innsbruck, 1880 *seqq.*

Mocenigo, Luigi. Relazione di Roma, 1560 : in *Albèri,* Vol. IV., Firenze, 1857.

Monumenta Ignatiana, Series I., Sancti Ignatii de Loyola Epistolæ

et Instructiones, 12 vols., Matriti, 1903–1911: Series IV., Scripta de Sancto Ignatio, Vol. I., Matriti, 1904.

Moran, Francis. Spicilegium Ossoriense. Vol. I., Dublin, 1874.

Moroni, G. Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastico. 109 vols. Venezia, 1840–1879.

Müller, Th. Das Konklave Pius' IV., 1559. Gotha, 1889.

Müntz, E. Histoire de l'art pendant la Renaissance: Italie. 3 vols., Paris, 1889–1895.

Musotti, F. Sommario del Concilio Tridentino (in *Döllinger*, Berichte und Tagebücher II., Nördlingen, 1876, pp. 1–50).

Nadal, H., S.J. Epistolæ ab anno 1546 ad 1577. 4 vols. Matriti, 1898-1905.

Narducci, H. Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum in Bibliotheca Angelica. Romæ, 1893.

Neher, S. J. Kirchliche Geographie und Statistik. 2 vols. Regensburg, 1864.

Nolhac, P. de. La Bibliothèque de F. Orsini. Paris, 1887.

Novaes, G. de. Storia de'pontefici. Vol. VII. Roma, 1822.

Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland. Ed. by *W. Friedensburg.* Vols. I.–VI. and VIII.–X. Gotha, 1892–1908.

Opitz, Th. Maria Stuart. 2 vols. Freiburg, 1879.

Orano, D. Liberi pensatori bruciati in Roma dal XVI. al XVIII. secolo. Roma, 1904.

Pagliucchi, P. I. Castellani del Castel S. Angelo di Roma. Vol. I., pars 2, I Castellani Vescovi (1464–1566). Roma, 1909.

Palandri, E. P. Les Négociations politiques et religieuses entre la Toscane et la France (1544–1580). Paris, 1908.

Pallavicini, Sf. Istoria del Concilio di Trento. 3 vols. Roma, 1664.

Panvinius, O. De creatione Pii IV. papæ: in *Merkle*, Conc. Trid. II., Frib. Brisg., 1911, pp. 575–601.

Paris, L. Négociations, lettres et pièces diverses relatives au règne de Francois II. Paris, 1841.

Pastor, L. von. Allgemeine Dekrete der Römischen Inquisition aus den Jahren 1555 bis 1597. Freiburg, 1912.

Paulus, N. Hexenwahn und Hexenprozess vornehmlich im 16 Jahrh. Freiburg, 1910.

Petramellarius, J. A. Ad librum O. Panvinii de summis pontif. et S.R.E. cardinalibus a Paulo IV. ad Clementis VIII. annum pontificatus octavum continuatio. Bononiæ, 1599.

Petrucelli della Gattina, F. Histoire diplomatique des Conclaves. Vol. II., Paris, 1864.

Philippson, M. Philipp II. von Spanien und das Papsttum: Hist. Zeitschrift, 1878, München, pp. 269–315, 419–457.

——— Westeuropa in Zeitalter Philipps II., Elisabeths und Heinrichs IV. Berlin, 1882.

——— Histoire du règne de Marie Stuart. 2 vols. Paris, 1891.

Phillips, Geo. Kirchenrecht. Vols. I.–VII., Regensburg, 1845–1872; Vol. VIII., part 1 by *F. H. Vering*, 1889.

Picot. Essai historique sur l'influence de la religion en France pendant le XVII.e siècle. Vol. I., Louvain, 1824.

Pierling, P. La Russie et le Saint-Siège. Vol. I., Paris, 1896.
Pio IV. e Felipe II., 1563–1564 (Coleccion de libros españoles raros y curiosos; Vol. XX.), Madrid, 1891.
Piot, see: Correspondance du card. Granvelle.
Pirenne, H. Geschichte Belgiens. Vol. III. (1477–1567); Gotha, 1907.
Planck, G. J. Anecdota ad historiam concilii Tridentini pertinentia. Gottingæ, 1791–1818.
Platzhoff, W. Die Theorie von der Mordbefugnis der Obrigkeit im 16 Jahrh. (Historische Studien, No. 54), Berlin, 1906.
Plon. Leone Leoni. Paris, 1886.
Pogiani, Julii. Sunensis epistolæ et orationes olim collectæ ab *Ant. M. Gratiano,* nunc ab *Hier. Lagomarsinio* e Soc. Jesu adnotationibus illustratæ ac primum editæ. Vols. I.-IV., Romæ, 1762-1768.
Polenz, G. v. Geschichte des französischen Calvinismus., Vols. II., III., Gotha, 1859.
Pollen, J. H., S.J. Papal negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots, 1561-1567. (Scottish Hist. Society, Vol. 37), Edinburgh, 1901.
Portioli, Attilio. Lettere inedite di Bernardo Tasso. Mantova, 1871.
Poullet, see: Correspondance du card. Granvelle.
Prat, J. M. Maldonat et l'université de Paris au XVI.e siècle. Paris, 1856.
Prescott, W. H. History of the reign of Philip II. 3 vols., Leipzig, 1856-1859.
Psalmæus, Nicol. Fragmenta de Concilio Tridentino: ed. *Merkle,* conc. Trid. II. Frib. Brisg., 1911, pp. 721-881.

Quellen und Forschungen aus italienischen Bibliotheken und Archiven. Vols. I. *seqq.* Rome, 1898 *seqq.*

Ranke, L. von. Französische Geschichte. 2nd ed. Stuttgart, 1856.
——— Englische Geschichte. Vol. I. Berlin, 1859.
——— Die römischen Päpste in den laetzten vier Jahrhunderten. Vols. I., III., 8th ed. Leipzig, 1885.
Raynaldus, O. Annales ecclesiastici, vols. XIV., XV. Lucæ, 1755-1756.
Real-Enzyklopädie für protest, Theologie und Kirche: Ed. by *J. J. Herzog.* 23 vols., 3rd ed. by *A. Hauck.* Leipzig, 1896-1909.
Reimann, E. Unterhandlungen Ferdinands I. und Pius IV. über das Konzil im Jahre 1560 und 1561: Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte, vol. VI. Göttingen, 1866, pp. 585-626.
——— Die Sendung des Nuntius Commendone nach Deutschland im Jahre, 1561: Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte, vol. VII. Göttingen, 1867, pp. 228-280.
Reinhardt-Steffens, Die Nuntiatur von Giov. Bonhomini, 1579-1581. Introduction: Studien zur Geschichte der katholischen Schweiz im Zeitalter Carlo Borromeos. Solothurn, 1910.— Documents, vol. I.: Aktenstücke zur Vorgeschichte der

Nuntiatur, 1570-1579; die Nuntiaturberichte Bonhominis und seine Korrespondenz mit Carlo Borromeo aus dem Jahre, 1579. Solothurn, 1906.
Relacye. Nuncyuszów Apostolskich i innych osób o Polsce od roku 1548 do 1690. Ed. *E. Rykaczewski.* Vol. I. Berlin-Posnan, 1864.
Renazzi, F. M. Storia dell' università degli studi di Roma, detta la Sapienza. 2 vols. Roma, 1803-1804.
Reumont, A. von. Die Carafa von Maddaloni. Vol. I. Berlin, 1851.
——— Beiträge zur italienischen Geschichte. 6 vols. Berlin, 1853-1857.
——— Geschichte der Stadt Rom. Vol. III. Berlin, 1870.
——— Geschichte Toskanas. 1st. part. Gotha, 1876.
Reusch, H. Der Index der verbotenen Bücher. 2 vols. Bonn, 1883-1885.
Revue historique. Paris, 1876 *seqq.*
Revue des questions historiques. Paris, 1866 *seqq.*
Ribier, G. Lettres et Mémoires d'Estat . . . sous le règnes de Francois I., Henri II. et François II. 2 vols. Paris, 1666.
Ricci, C. Geschichte der Kunst in Nord-Italien. Stuttgart, 1911.
Rieger-Vogelstein. Geschichte der Juden in Rom. 2 vols. Berlin, 1895-1896.
Riess, L. Die Politik Pauls IV. und seiner Nepoten. (Historische Studien, 67). Berlin, 1909.
Riezler, S. Geschichte Bayerns. Vol. IV. Gotha, 1899.
Ripoll-Brémond. Bullarium ordinis Prædicatorum. Vol. V. Romæ, 1733.
Ritter, M. Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegen reformation und des Dreissigjährigen Krieges (1555-1648). Vol. I. (1555-1586), Stuttgart, 1889.
Rocchi, E. Le piante iconografiche e prospettive di Roma del secolo XVI. colla riproduzione degli studi originali autografi di A. da Sangallo il Giovane per le fortificazioni di Roma, etc. Torino-Roma, 1902.
Rodocanachi, E. Le Saint-Siège et les Juifs. Le Ghetto à Rome. Paris, 1891.
——— Les Institutions communales de Rome sous la Papauté. Paris, 1901.
——— Le Capitole Romain antique et moderne. Paris, 1904.
——— Le château Saint-Ange. Paris, 1909.
Rohault de Fleury. Le Latran au Moyen-âge. Paris, 1877.
Römische Quartalschrift. Rome, 1887 *seqq.*
Rosi, M. La riforma religiosa e l' Italia nel secolo XVI. Catania, 1892.
——— La riforma religiosa in Liguria e l'eretico umbro Bartolomeo Bartoccio. (Atti della Società Ligure di storia patria, vol. 24). Genova, 1894.
Ruble, A. de. Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret. 4 vols. Paris, 1897.

Saftien, K. Die Verhandlungen Kaiser Ferdinands I. mit Papst Pius IV. über die fakultative Einführung des Laienkelches in einzelnen Teilen des deutschen Reiches. Göttingen, 1890.

Sägmüller, J. B. Die Papstwahlbullen und das staatliche Recht der Exklusive. Tübingen, 1892.

Sala, A. Documenti circa la vita e le gesta di S. Carlo Borromeo. 3 vols. Milano, 1857-1861.

Salmeron, see : Epistolæ P. Alph. Salmeronis.

San Carlo Borromeo nel terzo centenario della canonizzatione. Periodico mensile, Nov. 1908 al Dicembre 1910.

Santori, G. A., cardinale di S. Severino : Autobiografia, ed. *G. Cugnoni :* Archivio della R. Soc. Rom. di storia patria. Vol. XII. Roma, 1889.

Sarpi [*Pietro Soave Polano*], Historia del concilio Tridentino. 4 H. Ed. Genova, 1660.

Schäfer, H. Geschichte Portugals. 5 vols. Hamburg, 1836-1854

Schelhorn, J. G. Ergötzlichkeiten aus der Kirchenhistorie und Literatur. 3 vols. Ulm, Leipzig, 1762-1764.

Schiemann, Th. Russland, Polen und Livland bis zum 17 Jahrhundert. Vol. II. Berlin, 1886.

Schmid, J. Die deutsche Kaiser und Königswahl und die römische Kurie in den Jahren 1538-1620 (Historisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft, vol. VI.). München, 1885.

Segesser, A. P. von. Ludwig Pfyffer und seine Zeit. 2 vols. Bern, 1880-1881.

Sentis, F. J. Die "Monarchia Sicula." Freiburg, 1869.

Serafini, C. Le Monete e le bulle plumbee pontificie del Medag liere Vaticano. Vol. I. Roma, 1910.

Serristori, see : Legazioni.

Sickel, Th. Zur Geschcihte des Konzils von Trient. Vienna, 1872.

——— Römische Berichte I.-V. : Sitzungsberichte der Weiner Akademie der Wissenschaften, vols. 133, 136, 141, 143, 144. Vienna, 1893-1901.

Sismondi, S. Geschichte der italienischen Freistaaten im Mittelalter. 16 vols. Zurich, 1824.

Skibniewski, S. L. Corvin von. Geschichte des Römischen Katechismus. Rom-Regensburg, 1903.

Soldan, M. G. Geschichte des Protestantismus in Frankreich. Vol. I. Leipzig, 1855.

Soranzo, Giacomo. Relazione di Roma, 1565 : in *Albèri, II.*, 4. Firenze, 1857, pp. 129-160.

Soranzo, Girolamo. Relazione di Roma, 1563, in *Albèri, II.*, 4. Firenze, 1857, pp. 67-120.

Spicilegio Vaticano di documenti inediti e rari estratti dagli archivi e dalla bibl. della Sede Apost. Vol. I. Roma, 1890.

Spillmann, J., S.J. Die englischen Martyrer unter Heinrich VIII. und Elisabeth (1535-1583). 2nd Ed. Freiburg, 1900.

Steinherz, S. Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland (1560-1572). Vols. I., II., IV. Vienna, 1897-1914.

——— Briefe des Prager Erzbischofs Anton Brus von Müglitz, 1562-1563. Prag, 1907.

Steinmann, E. Die Porträtdarstellungen des Michelangelo. Leipzig, 1913.

Stevenson, J. Calendar of State Papers. Foreign Series. Elisabeth, 1558-1565. Vols. I.-VII. London, 1863-1870.

Stimmen aus Maria-Laach. Freiburg, 1871 *seqq.*

Studi e documenti di storia e diritto. Pubblic. periodica dell' Accad. di conferenze storico-giuridice. Roma, 1880 *seqq.*

Šusta, J. Pius IV. préd pontifikáten a na pocátku pontifikátu. Praha, 1900.

——— Die römische Kurie und das Konzil von Trient unter Pius IV. 4 vols. Vienna, 1904-1914.

Swoboda, H. Das Konzil von Trient, sein Schauplatz, Verlauf und Ertrag. Vienna, 1912.

Sylvain. Histoire de St. Charles Borromée. 3 vols. Milan, 1884.

Synopsis Actorum S. Sedis in causa Societatis Jesu, 1540–1605. Florentiæ, 1887 (for private circulation only).

Tacchi Venturi, P., S.J. Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia. Vol. I. Roma, 1909.

Taja, Agostino. Descrizione del Palazzo Apostolico Vaticano. Roma, 1750.

Theiner, A. Schweden und seine Stellung zum Heiligen Stuhl unter Johann III., Sigmund III. und Karl IX. 2 vols. Augsburg, 1838.

——— Vetera Monumenta Poloniæ et Lithuaniæ. Vol. II. Romæ, 1861.

——— Acta genuiná Concilii Tridentini. 2 vols. Agram, 1874.

Theologisches Literaturblatt. Von Prof. *F. H. Reusch.* 1–12 Jahrg. Bonn, 1866–1877.

Thode, H. Michelangelo und das Ende der Renaissance. 5 vols. Berlin, 1902—1908.

Thompson, J. W. The Wars of Religion in France, 1559–1576. Chicago, 1909.

Tiepolo, Paolo. Relazione da Roma in tempo di Pio IV. e di Pio V.: in *Albèri*, II., 4, Firenze, 1857, pp. 169–196.

Tiraboschi, G. Storia della letteratura Italiana. 10 vols. Modena, 1772 *seqq.*

Titi, Filippo. Descrizione delle pitture, sculture e architetture esposte al pubblico in Roma. Roma, 1763.

Tomassetti, Gius. La Campagna Romana antica, mediævale e moderna. Vols. I., II. Roma, 1910.

Törne, P. O. von. Ptolémée Gallio, Cardinal de Côme. Etude sur la Cour de Rome, etc. au XVI.^{e} siècle. Helsingfors, 1907.

Trésal, J. Les origines du schisme Anglican. Paris, 1908.

Tübingen Theologische Quartalschrift. Tübingen, 1819 *seqq.*

Turba, see: Dispacci di Germania.

Turgenjew, Alex. Historica Russiæ Monumenta. Petropoli, 1841–1848.

Uebersberger, H. Oesterreich und Russland seit dem Ende des 15 Jahrhunderts. Vol. I., 1488–1606. Vienna, 1906.

Vaissette. Histoire de Languedoc. Vol. V. Paris, 1745.

Vasari, G. Le vite de'più eccellenti pittori, scultori ed architettori. Ediz. di *G. Milanesi.* Firenze, 1878 *seqq.*

Venuti, R. Numismata Romanorum Pontificum a Martino V. ad Benedictum XIV. Romæ, 1744.

Verga, Ettore. Il municipio di Milano e l'Inquisizione di Spagna 1563. Milano, 1897.
Vertot. Histoire des chevaliers de St. Jean de Jérusalem. 5 vols. Paris, 1727.
Voss, W. Die Verhandlungen Pius' IV. mit den Katholischen Mächten über die Neuberufung des Tridentiner Konzils in Jahre 1560. Leipzig, 1887.

Wahrmund, L. Das Ausschliessungsrecht (jus exclusivæ) bei den Papstwahlen. Vienna, 1889.
Wiedemann, Th. Geschichte der Reformation und Gegenreformation in Lande unter der Enns. 4 vols. Prag, 1879–1884.
Wotschke. Geschichte der Reformation in Polen. Leipzig, 1911.
Wymann, E. Kardinal Karl Borromeo in seinen Beziehungen zur alten Eidgenossenschaft. Stans, 1910.

Zakrzewski. Powstanie i wzrost reformacyi w Polsce. Lipsk, 1870.
Zaleski, K. S. Jesuici w Polsce. Vols. I., IV. Lwów, 1900–1905.
Zeitschrift, Historische. Ed. by *H. v. Sybel.* München, 1859 *seqq.*
Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie. Vols. 1–44. Innsbruck, 1877–1920.
Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte. Ed. by *Brieger.* Gotha, 1877 *seqq.*
Zinkeisen, J. M. Geschichte des osmanischen Reiches in Europa. Gotha, 1840 *seqq.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOLUME XV.

CHAPTER I.

THE CONCLAVE OF 1559.

A.D.		PAGE
1559	Popular outburst at the death of Paul IV.	1
	Reaction against the dead Pope	2
	Cardinal Morone released from prison and reinstated	3
	Hatred of the Carafa, who are deprived of the rights of citizenship	4
	The Cardinals take the part of the Carafa; Carlo Carafa recalled and reinstated	5
	Obsequies of the late Pope	5
	The Cardinals go into conclave	6
	The number of electors present in Rome	6
	Paul IV.'s attempt to exclude Morone and Este	7
	Este's hopes of the tiara	8
	The wishes of the French Government	9
	The aims of Philip II.	10
	The candidates supported by Spain	11
	The representatives of Ferdinand I. and Philip II.	11
	Policy of the Duke of Florence	12
	Peculiar party conditions in the conclave	13
	Decisive influence of the party of Carafa	14
	Personal aims of Carlo Carafa; he is supported by Farnese	15
	Unsuccessful attempt to elect Carpi by acclamation	16
	The election capitulation	16
	The first scrutiny	17
	Difficulty of deciding upon a candidate	18
	Morone offers to withdraw	20
	The French attempt to elect Tournon	20
	Divisions in the Spanish party	22
	The candidature of Gonzaga	23
	Arrival of the Spanish Ambassador, Francisco de Vargas	25
	His feverish activity	26
	Failure of the Franco-Spanish alliance	27
	Selfish aims of the party leaders	27
	Coolness between Vargas and Sforza	28
	Application for further instructions to Philip II.	29
	Fresh attempt to elect Gonzaga	29
	Affairs at a standstill in the conclave	30
	Indignation in Rome; the Conservators complain to the Cardinals	31

A.D. PAGE
Non-observance of the enclosure . . . 31
Philip II. is unwilling to give definite instructions 32
Complete indecision in the conclave; the ballots a mere matter of form . . . 32
Impatience of Carafa 33
Who approaches the French party . . 34
Vargas, on his own responsibility, gives bribes to Carafa 35
Philip II. shatters the hopes of Carafa, but decides against Gonzaga 36
The indiscretion of Vargas . . . 37
Carafa makes overtures to the French party . 38
And seems to hold the election in his hand . 40
Este believes that his time has come . . 41
Desperation of Vargas 41
Unhealthy conditions in the conclave . . 42
Disturbances in the city 43
An attempt made to ensure the enclosure . 44
Interference by the ambassadors; Vargas rebuked by the Dean, du Bellay . . . 45
Dignified message from Philip II., disclaiming all wish to interfere 45
Popular fear of a French Pope . . . 46
Carafa goes over to the side of Spain . . 47
The candidature of Gonzaga again put forward . 47
Attempt to elect Carpi 48
Alliance of Carafa and Sforza . . . 49
The Spaniards and Carafa attempt the election of Pacheco 50
Weariness of the electors 53
Panvinio's account of the last days of the conclave; the decision lies between Cesi and Medici . 54
Sudden turn of affairs 55
The candidature of Medici the only course possible 56
Guise agrees to this 57
And at length Alfonso Carafa gives his consent . 58
Activity of the Duke of Florence . . 59
The election of Medici practically assured . 60
The election of Cardinal Medici (Dec. 25th) . 61
He takes the name of Pius IV. . . . 62
Displeasure of Philip II. with Vargas . . 63

CHAPTER II.

PREVIOUS LIFE AND CHARACTER OF PIUS IV. THE BEGINNING OF HIS PONTIFICATE.

The Medici of Milan; not related to the celebrated Florentine family 66
1519 The parents of Pius IV.; death of his father . 67
Gian Angelo studies jurisprudence at Pavia . 67

A.D.		PAGE
1521	His elder brother, Gian Giacomo, becomes Castellan of Musso, and the terror of the neighbourhood	68
1526	Gian Angelo goes to Rome on a diplomatic mission	69
1529	The family fortunes decline; Gian Giacomo out of favour with the Emperor . . .	70
1531	The "Musso War"	71
1532	Gian Giacomo loses his possessions; he enters the service of the Emperor . . .	72
	Gian Angelo returns to Rome; he obtains the favour of Cardinal Alessandro Farnese .	73
1534	Who is elected Pope as Paul III. . .	73
1539	Advancement of Gian Angelo; Governor of Fano and Parma; Commissary with the Papal troops	74
1545	A matrimonial alliance arranged with the Farnese	74
	Slow advancement of Gian Angelo; his disappointment; a hard but salutary school . .	75
	He becomes Archbishop of Ragusa . .	76
1547	Vice-legate of Bologna	77
1549	Gian Angelo created Cardinal . . .	77
1550	His influence in the conclave which elected Julius III.	77
1553	He is held in high esteem by the new Pope, and made Bishop of Cassano and of Foligno (1556)	78
	His knowledge of canon law . . .	78
1555	He is not in favour with Paul IV., and opposes the war with Spain	79
	His relations with the Pope grow more strained .	80
1558	Cardinal Medici leaves Rome . . .	81
	His close relations with Cosimo I., who sees in him the future Pope	81
	"The Father of the poor" . . .	82
1559	He is elected Pope; joy of the Romans . .	83
1560	Personal appearance of Pius IV. . . .	84
	His extraordinary activity . . .	85
	State of his health; his daily life . .	87
	His general friendliness and affability . .	88
	His knowledge of literature and canon law, but lack of deep theological knowledge . .	89
	His statesmanship, and grasp of business matters	90
	His good relations with the ambassadors; a great contrast to Paul IV. . . .	91
	Special value attached by the Pope to the friendship of Venice	92

CHAPTER III.

THE POPE'S RELATIVES. CHARLES BORROMEO. DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE PRINCES.

Few Popes have had so many relatives as Pius IV.	94
The family of Hohenems	94
The family of Borromeo	95
The Serbelloni	96

A.D.		PAGE
1560	The Pope's special love for the Borromei; Charles Borromeo summoned to Rome; a memorable day for the Church	96
	Rapid promotion of Charles Borromeo; he is created Cardinal	97
	He becomes Archbishop of Milan, and Secretary of State	98
	The marriage of Federigo Borromeo and Virginia della Rovere	99
	Cosimo I. in Rome; disappointment of his ambitions	100
	Promotion of the Serbelloni nephews	101
	Jealousy of the Hohenems and Serbelloni of the Borromei	102
	Mark Sittich von Hohenems created Cardinal, but	103
	The Pope's affections centred in the Borromei	104
	His choice of Charles as Secretary of State a brilliant success, and a decisive factor of his reign	105
	Dissatisfaction of the diplomatists and officials	105
	Unimposing personality and excessive reserve of Borromeo	105
	The ambassadors come to appreciate him better	106
	Early days of Borromeo; his studies and purity of life	107
	His early talent for administration	108
	The Pope bestows many important and lucrative offices on Borromeo, but he remains simple and unassuming	109
	His assiduity and hard work at the Secretariate	110
	The whole of the diplomatic correspondence passes through his hands	111
	His recreations	112
	Magnificence of his household, and pride in his family	112
1561	Federigo Borromeo Captain-General of the Church	114
1562	Sudden death of Federigo Borromeo	114
	Charles Borromeo resolves to renounce all worldly ambitions	116
1563	He receives Holy Orders	117
	And adopts a stricter manner of life	118
	The Pope and the Court displeased at the change	118
1564	Ascetic life of Borromeo; he reduces his state, and devotes himself to penance	119
	His exemplary life causes general admiration	121
	Pius IV.'s esteem for Cardinal Morone	122
	His sense of statesmanship shown in his treatment of the princes	123
1560	He recognizes the Imperial dignity of Ferdinand I.	124
	And fills the nunciatures left vacant by Paul IV.	125
	He again allows the carnival festivities, and limits the power of the Inquisition	126
	And mitigates the decrees of Paul IV.	127
	But by no means breaks off the work of reform	128
	Improved condition of the city	129

CHAPTER IV.

THE FALL OF THE HOUSE OF CARAFA.

A.D.		PAGE
	Hatred of the Carafa in Rome	131
	Renewed arrogance of Cardinal Carlo; his schemes for the restoration of the family fortunes	133
	Pius IV. looks with favour upon his hopes	134
	The enemies of the Carafa; Colonna, Sforza, Madruzzo and Gonzaga	135
1559	The former crimes of the family are renewed during the last days of Paul IV.	136
	The murder of Marcello Capece at Soriano	137
	The murder of the Duchess of Paliano (August)	138
1560	Pius IV. decides to take action against the Carafa	138
	Accusations against the two Carafa Cardinals	139
	Attitude of Philip II.; his growing hostility to the Carafa	140
	Secret activity of the enemies of the Carafa	141
	Carlo Carafa blind to his danger	142
	The Duke of Paliano returns to Rome (June)	143
	Arrest of the two Cardinals and the Duke	144
	Pius IV.'s statement to the consistory	145
	General approval of the Pope's action	146
	Pallantieri and Federicis entrusted with the trial.	147
	The charges against the Carafa	147
	The opening of the trial (July)	148
	Carlo Carafa's trust in Philip II.	149
	His arrogant behaviour at the trial	150
	His imprisonment made more severe; he is charged with compromising relations with the Turks and heretics	151
	The trial draws to an end (September)	152
	The complicity of the Cardinal in the murder of the Duchess	153
	The charges proved, but the trial is conducted in a very biased way	154
	The advocates of the Carafa	155
	Many persons intercede on their behalf	156
1561	Consistory to decide the sentences	158
	Written confession of the Duke of Paliano (January)	159
	Arrest of Cardinal Rebiba (February)	161
	Creation of new Cardinals (February)	162
	The intervention of Philip II. now the only hope of the Carafa	164
	Embarrassment of the king, but he refuses to intervene	165
	The consistory of March 2nd; enumeration of the crimes of the Carafa	166
	The sentence pronounced (March 4th); Carlo Carafa, Paliano, d'Alife and Cardine condemned to death	167

A.D.		PAGE
	Complete conversion of Giovanni Carafa	167
	His farewell letter to his son	168
	The execution of Carlo Carafa	171
	The execution of Paliano, d'Alife and Cardine	171
	Cardinal Alfonso reinstated, but leaves Rome	173
	Philip II. contrives to escape odium	175
	The conduct of Pius IV. not above reproach	176
	His own explanation of his motives	177
	An effective blow at the old nepotism	177

CHAPTER V.

NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE RE-OPENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

1559	Pius IV. declares his intention of re-opening the Council	180
1560	Difficulty of securing the support of the princes	180
	The attitude of Ferdinand I. at first favourable	180
	Divergent views among the princes become apparent	181
	Philip II.'s reluctance to commit himself	182
	The attitude of the Emperor and France	183
	Fear of a national council in France	184
	Eagerness of Pius IV. to carry on the work of reform	185
	He emphatically declares his intention of summoning the Council before the assembled ambassadors	186
	Philip II. expresses his agreement	187
	France continues to make difficulties	188
	Hesitating attitude of Ferdinand I.; he expresses his objections in a memorandum	189
	This practically negatives the idea of a Council	189
	The Imperial ambassador, Arco, in Rome	193
	Diplomatic shrewdness of Pius IV.	194
	His replies to Spain, France and the Emperor	195
	Delfino sent to Ferdinand I.	196
	The Pope's answer to the Emperor's memorandum	197
	Prospero Santa Croce and Philip II.	198
	France refuses to change her attitude	199
	Determination of the Pope	200
	Philip II. insists on the Council being declared a continuation of the previous assembly	201
	The Pope decides to summon the Council at all costs	202
	Pius IV. inspired by his high office	203
	Delfino in Vienna	205
	Ferdinand I. continues to make difficulties	206
	Divergent views among the Cardinals	207
	The advice of Delfino	209
	The Emperor and France agree to the summoning of the Council to Trent	210
	The Pope orders the drafting of the bull of convocation	211
	Jubilee indulgence proclaimed	211

A.D. PAGE
The bull of convocation (November 29th) . 213
Copies of the bull sent to the princes . . 214
The word "continuation" avoided . . 215

CHAPTER VI.

THE MISSION OF COMMENDONE AND DELFINO TO GERMANY.

1560 The Council evidently a continuation of the former assembly at Trent 216
The bull of convocation taken to France by Abbot Niquet 217
Giovanni Commendone chosen to take the bull to the Emperor, and to the princes of north Germany 218
Delfino chosen to go to the princes of south Germany 218
1561 The two nuncios have an audience with Ferdinand I. 220
The Emperor's advice to the nuncios . . 221
They visit the Diet of the princes assembled at Naumburg 222
Their invitation to the Council meets with an insulting rejection 223
Commendone at Leipsic and Magdeburg . . 226
He proceeds to Berlin; the Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg 280
Hildesheim, Paderborn and Münster . . 228
Commendone visits the Elector of Trêves . 229
Commendone in Cologne 231
He goes to the Netherlands . . . 232
Proposed visit to Denmark . . . 233
And to Sweden 234
He receives orders to return to Rome . . 236
And visits Nancy, Metz, Mayence and Nuremberg on his way 237
Commendone in Bavaria 237
Delfino in south Germany . . . 238
His conversation with Vergerio . . . 239
Duke Albert of Bavaria 240
Neither mission crowned with much success . 240

CHAPTER VII.

FINAL PREPARATIONS FOR THE RE-OPENING OF THE COUNCIL.

1561 Ferdinand I. accepts the Council in principle . 241
But raises many difficulties . . . 242
The legates for the Council appointed . . 243
Cardinal Gonzaga, the senior legate, an excellent choice 244
Puteo, Simonetta, Hosius and Seripando his colleagues , , . . . 245

A.D. PAGE
Officials of the Council appointed 246
Indecision of the Emperor 248
Difficulties about the bull in Spain 248
Philip II. insists on a declaration of "continuation" 249
The Emperor continues to defer his decision 250
Papal envoys sent to Russia and Poland 251
Welcome zeal of the King of Portugal 251
Gonzaga and Seripando make their solemn entry into Trent (April 16th) 252
Very few bishops present in Trent 252
Raverta as nuncio in Spain 253
A secret "bull of continuation" sent to Philip II. 253
Who orders the Spanish bishops to prepare to go to Trent 253
Ferdinand I. still refuses to name a fixed date 254
The Italian bishops ordered to go to Trent 254
Nevertheless, the prelates assemble very slowly 255
France and the Emperor still delay 256
The Emperor's representatives chosen (December) 257
Cardinal Mark Sittich to be legate instead of Puteo 257
Arrival of Cardinal Simonetta at Trent 258
The Pope's instructions: "The Council must be opened as soon as possible." 258
The Pope's orders as to the work to be taken in hand 259
The legates decide to postpone the opening until January 260
Discussions as to procedure 261
1562 The first General Congregation held (January) 15th 262
Demands of the Spanish bishops 263

CHAPTER VIII.

RE-OPENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. SESSIONS XVII. TO XXII.

1562 The solemn opening of the Council (January 18th) 264
The envoys received 266
Demands of the representatives of the Emperor 267
The XVIIIth Session of the Council (February 26th) 267
Further demands of the Imperial envoys 269
The Pope orders the Council to proceed to the discussion of questions of dogma 270
Arrival of more envoys 271
The controversy as to the divine origin of the duty of residence 272
The Papal primacy affected by this question 273
Divergent views and heated discussions 274
The question referred to the Pope 274
Interference on the part of the envoys 275
The French envoys demand a postponement 276
The XIXth Session of the Council (May 14th) 277

A.D. PAGE
The Pope reserves his decision as to residence 278
The Pope's articles of reform 279
Further legates suggested 280
The Pope rebukes the legates for their want of unity 281
Danger of a dissolution 282
The XXth Session of the Council (June 3rd) 284
Communion under both kinds discussed 285
The reform libellum of Ferdinand I. 286
The demand for the chalice for the laity 289
The XXIst Session of the Council (July 16th) 290
The decrees on Communion 290
Reform decrees 290
Dissensions among the legates 291
Gonzaga determines to ask for his recall 292
Reconciliation of the legates 293
Philip II. orders the Spanish bishops to withdraw their demands 294
Discussion of the question of the chalice for the laity 295
Impressive speech by Lainez 296
The XXIInd Session of the Council (September 17th) 297
The decree on the Mass 297

CHAPTER IX.

THE MISSION OF MORONE TO FERDINAND I. AT INNSBRUCK.

1562-3.

1562 The reform libellum of Ferdinand I. 299
The Spaniards press the *ius divinum* of the episcopate 301
Able speech of Lainez against this 301
Arrival of the French prelates (November 23rd) 303
Important position taken by Cardinal Guise 303
The question of the episcopal office 305
Danger to the Papal supremacy 306
The next Session repeatedly postponed 307
1563 French reform proposals 308
Ferdinand I. again intervenes with fresh demands 308
Cardinal Guise at Innsbruck 309
Suggested coalition of the Catholic powers to dominate the Council 309
Death of Cardinal Gonzaga (March 2nd) 310
Death of Cardinal Seripando (March 17th) 311
Reform demands of the Emperor 312
Pius IV. is inclined to suspend the Council 313
Imperative need of coming to an understanding with the Emperor 314
Morone to go to the Imperial court 315
Morone and Navagero appointed legates to the Council 315
Morone's pre-eminent qualities for this office 316

A.D. PAGE
Morone arrives in Trent (April 10th), and at once sets out for Innsbruck . . . 317
He at once opens negotiations with the Emperor . 317
He realizes the good intentions of Ferdinand . 318
The advisers of Ferdinand put difficulties in his way 319
But Morone's skill and personality bring the negotiations to a successful conclusion . . 321
A full agreement reached on most points . 322
Morone leaves Innsbruck (May 13th) . . 323
Satisfaction of the Pope at Morone's success . 325
Disgust of the enemies of Rome . . . 325
Return of Morone to Trent . . . 327

CHAPTER X.

THE CONCLUDING SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

1563 Better relations between the Pope and Philip II. . 328
Vargas is replaced by Requesens . . 328
The "right of proposition" at the Council . 330
The episcopate and the primacy . . . 332
Lainez defends the rights of the Holy See (June 16th) 332
The Spanish bishops and the episcopal power . 334
Change of front on the part of Cardinal Guise . 335
The XXIIIrd Session of the Council (July 15th) . 336
Decree on Holy Orders and the hierarchy of the Church 337
The education and training of priests . . 338
The close of the Council in sight . . 339
The reform of the princes demanded . . 340
Usurpations of authority by the civil power . 340
A draft of reform decrees presented to the envoys. 341
A storm of protest from the powers . . 343
The demands of Ferdinand I. . . . 344
Courageous reply of Morone . . . 345
French protests 346
Difficult position of the legates . . . 347
Outburst on the part of du Ferrier, the French envoy 348
Indignation in the Council . . . 349
Cardinal Guise in Rome 350
He is treated with great honour by the Pope, and an understanding is reached . . . 351
Pius IV. and the election of Maximilian as King of the Romans 351
Ferdinand I. agrees to the closing of the Council . 352
The legates instructed to hasten the proceedings . 353
Proposals for the reform of the Sacred College . 354
The XXIVth Session of the Council (November 11th) 355
Decree on Matrimony 355
Reform decrees 356

A.D. PAGE
General wish to end the Council . . . 357
Spain alone holds back 358
The reform proposals modified . . . 359
News of the grave illness of the Pope . . 361
Decision to hold the last session at once . . 361
The XXVth and last Session of the Council (December 3rd) 362
Dogmatic and reform decrees . . . 363
Decree on indulgences 364
The close of the Council of Trent . . 365

CHAPTER XI.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

The Council had accomplished a mighty work . 366
No restoration of unity of faith . . 366
The breach now complete, and a new epoch begun 367
Clearing up of the religious position . . 367
The Holy Scriptures not the only source of faith . 368
The decree on Justification . . . 368
The decrees on the Sacraments and the Mass . 369
The primacy of the Roman See assured but not defined 370
Condemnation of the doctrines of the reformers . 371
The episcopate and the duty of residence . . 372
The formation of a good clergy . . . 374
Removal of abuses 375
The Christian family 376
The secular princes and absolutism . . 377
The secular priesthood 378
The Council a boundary line and a landmark . 378

LIST OF UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS IN APPENDIX.

PAGE

I. The Scrutinies in the Conclave of Pius IV. . 382
II. Francesco di Guadagno to the Duke of Mantua 386
III. The Dispatches of Marcantonio da Mula . 390
IV. Cardinal C. Carafa to the Duke of Paliano . 392
V. Consistory of 7th June, 1560 393
VI. Giov. Battista Ricasoli to Cosimo I., Duke of Florence 393
VII. Avviso di Roma of 8th June, 1560 . . 394
VIII. Motuproprio of Pope Pius IV. concerning the trial of the Carafa 396
IX-X. Marcantonio da Mula to Venice . . 401
XI. Marcantonio da Mula to Venice . . 401
XII. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua . 402
XIII. Consistory of 3rd March, 1561 . . 403
XIV. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua . 403
XV. Pope Pius IV. to Hannibal von Hohenems . 403
XVI. Marcantonio da Mula to Venice . . 404
XVII. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua . 406
XVIII. Avviso di Roma of 8th March, 1561 . . 407
XIX. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua . 409
XX. Avviso di Roma of 6 December, 1561 . 409
XXI. Avviso di Roma of 13 December, 1561 . 410
XXII. Avviso di Roma of 20 December, 1561 . 410
XXIII. Avviso di Roma of 10 January, 1562 . . 411
XXIV.-XXXIII. Reforming Activity of Pius IV. from February to May, 1562 . . . 411
XXXIV. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua . 414
XXXV. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua . 414
XXXVI. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua . 414
XXXVII. Onofrio Panvinio as Biographer of Pius IV. . 415

AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

At the present time the attention, not only of Catholics, but of the whole world, is more than ever directed to the Holy See, which stands out as the one solid rock amid the subversive and anarchical tendencies of our day. For the proper understanding of this, the most ancient, yet still so vigorous international power, it is above all necessary fully to understand her historical development. To set this forth, since the close of the Middle Ages, in accordance with the facts drawn from the best authorities, and in the most objective form possible, is the task to which I have set myself. For the latter half of the XVIth century I have had to make use of unpublished documents to an even greater extent than in the preceding volumes, since the subject which had to be treated in many ways resembled fallow land, which has first to be broken up with the plough before its actual cultivation can be begun. I have been actively occupied in procuring, examining and preparing all the documents available in Archives, and also in taking the fullest advantage of the immense amount of literature which is to be found in so many publications. The material increased to such an extent in this method of dealing with it that the original plan of uniting the closely related pontificates of Pius IV. and Pius V. had to be abandoned, and a division made. Both volumes were almost completed when the international war broke out and rendered their publication impossible. The literature which has since appeared, though not amounting to very much, has been added.

The dedication of the present volume to the eminent historian of the Council of Trent may serve as a remembrance of the twenty-five years which we spent in the Eternal City in close fraternal research and happy mutual labour in the same field. It is also, however, an expression of gratitude for the furtherance of my work by many valuable hints and suggestions drawn from the literary remains of our mutual friend, Professor Anton Pieper, who died so prematurely, and whose vast researches afforded important matter, especially for Pius V.

In spite of being cut off from Rome by the war, the past five years could nevertheless be utilized for the continuation of the History of the Popes, as the extracts from archives had long been collected. The difficulties resulting from the circumstances of the times were, however, very great, yet, in spite of this, it was possible to bring the description of the pontificates of Gregory XIII., Sixtus V., Clement VIII., Paul V., and Gregory XV. in all essential points, to completion, so that future volumes will follow closely upon one another. Should God grant me further life and health I may therefore hope for the happy completion of this work, to which I have devoted my powers since my youth. May it contribute to the resumption of relations with foreign scholars, so rudely broken off by the storms of war. Historical science cannot forego such an interchange of thoughts and ideas without suffering grave and lasting damage.

PASTOR.

Innsbruck, Oct. 27th, 1919.

INTRODUCTION.

THE restoration of ecclesiastical life in the XVIth century arose, as it had done in the days of Gregory VII., from within the Church herself, but with this difference, that the first incentive thereto was not given by the Holy See and the hierarchy, as had been the case in the XIth century, but by various individuals inspired by God. These, clinging fast to the precious treasure of the old faith, and firmly maintaining obedience to lawful ecclesiastical authority, worked, with burning zeal and unwearying diligence, first for their own sanctification, and only afterwards for the radical reform of their contemporaries. It is true that their endeavours for reform could only take firm root and permeate the whole Church when the Apostolic See took them in hand, and this turn of affairs, made possible by the agency of the great Popes of the houses of Farnese and Carafa, took place under the fourth and fifth Pius.

The foundation of a Catholic reformation was laid by the Council of Trent, which also pronounced so clearly in matters of dogma. The completion of the Council was the work of Pius IV., who, in spite of the greatest difficulties, succeeded in once more opening this general assembly of the Church, on which, in the midst of the great apostasy from Rome, all the hopes of the faithful were fixed.[1] With unwearied patience the Pope held fast to the Council, and steered it with the greatest sagacity through renewed troubles both from within and without, until he was at last able to bring it to a happy conclusion. A clever and sagacious man, he again limited the Inquisition to its proper sphere, and at once renewed the diplomatic relations with the Imperial court which had been broken off by his impetuous predecessor.

---

[1] *Cf.* the pamphlet composed under Pius IV. *De consolatione ecclesiae, in the Graziani Archives at Città di Castello, Istruzioni I., 102.

Though personally inclined to a more secular course of action, Pius IV., by his confirmation of the decrees of the Council, by his appointment of a special congregation to see to the carrying out of those decrees, as well as by his continuation of other important undertakings, such as the rearrangement of the Index, the compilation of a Catechism, and the reform of important liturgical books, proved his comprehension of the tasks of the Church, and won an ever lasting name by his work for Catholic reform. By confirming the decrees of the Council, he for the first time gave to the various regulations a legal sanction, while only by his care in enforcing their execution could the written law be introduced into active life, and the renewal of the ecclesiastical state be inaugurated.

In this manner the Apostolic See proved itself to be, even under a Pope in whose character there were many faults, a solid foundation and a safe place of refuge for the renewal of the prosperity of the Church. Without his intervention the entire reform work of Trent would have remained in the condition in which the canons of the previous sessions were at the time of the new assembly of the Council in 1562; that is to say, still awaiting execution because they had not as yet been confirmed by the Holy See.[1]

Pius IV. also continued with much greater success than his predecessor the regeneration of the Roman Curia, and the reform of its tribunals and scholastic institutions. It was, it is true, of extreme importance in this respect that his nephew and Secretary of State, Charles Borromeo, stood at his side as his assistant and adviser, a man who, like Gaetano di Tiene, Ignatius Loyola and Philip Neri, embodied the spirit of Catholic reformation in its purest form.

---

[1] The prelates assembled in Trent complained in 1562, "non havendo anco quel che si decretò intorno alla riforma (in the years 1546 and 1547) qualunque si fosse conseguito effecto alcuno" (the legates on April 9th, 1562, in ŠUSTA, Kurie, II., 79). The Pope replied that there was nothing to be astonished at, the Fathers of the Council themselves knew, "che i concilii che non sono finiti nè approbati dai papi, non obbligano altrui ad observargli, nè S. $S^{tà}$ poteva sforzargli" (*ibid.*, 111).

The carrying out of the decrees of the Council and the abolition of the manifold abuses which had taken such deep root during the period of the Renaissance naturally could not be the work of a single pontificate. It was therefore of the utmost importance that the right man, in the person of Pius V. (1566—1572), should have ascended the throne of St. Peter to carry into effect the reform plan of the Council of Trent, and to awaken new life in every part of Catholic Christendom. In his person the Papacy became the representative and the director of the Catholic reformation. This son of St. Dominic, a man who was on fire with consuming zeal for the purity of the faith, and of morals, and one who was absolutely unyielding when ecclesiastical affairs and the rights of the Church were in question, knew neither fear nor consideration for worldly interests. Without the faults and weaknesses of Paul IV., he yet saw eye to eye with him in so many matters that his adherents in Rome could joyfully proclaim that the Theatine Pope had risen again.[1] Their jubilation was well founded. Like Paul IV., who with iron hand had demolished deeply rooted, inveterate, and apparently ineradicable abuses, Pius V. courageously took up the difficult task of reform, and fearlessly devoted to it all his powers and all his holy zeal.

The spiritual affinity with Paul IV., whom Pius V. venerated in many respects as a father,[2] shows itself in no small degree in the manner in which he fulfilled his task of guarding the treasure of faith in the Church and of protecting her against the assaults of the religious innovators. The means he employed in so doing were entirely in keeping with the character of a time when force and compulsion were used to subdue spiritual revolt, the strongest measures seeming all the more necessary as the attacks of the innovators were always increasing in violence.

---

[1] SANTORI, Autobiografia, XIII., 379.

[2] See the letter to King Sebastian of Portugal of October 27, 1567, in LADERCHI, Annales eccl., 1567, n. 17.

In the new and ever extending form of Protestantism founded by Calvin there existed a far more dangerous, systematic and consistent enemy than in Lutheranism, which was now growing torpid, and was being torn to pieces by disputes within itself. Calvinism, with its rigid organization, its harsh doctrines, its demand for the bloody extermination of Catholics,[1] and its propaganda, was fanning to fever heat the lust of Protestantism to attack the old Church. An international monument was thereby called into being to such an extent that Geneva became almost a second Rome, and Calvin another Pope, who carried on a correspondence in every direction with the whole of Europe. In Germany and Scandinavia, Protestantism in its Lutheran form had already gained a firm footing, and Calvinism therefore threw itself with all its force upon the west of Europe, in order completely to annihilate the Catholic Church beyond the Alps. Together with the Germans, the Romans, as well as the Slavs and Magyars were always being more and more involved in the religious changes, and led into opposition to the Papacy. A third form of Protestantism had at the same time arisen in England, in the Episcopal State Church. The one point on which the reformers were agreed was the complete subjection and eradication of Catholic worship, the practice of which was in many places, especially in England, Ireland, Scotland, Denmark and Sweden, even punishable by death.

The Catholics were, therefore, carrying on a war of self-preservation when they sacrificed everything to prevent the inroads of Protestanism, or to drive it out where it had already obtained a footing. Pius V., who opposed the enemies of the Church with all his power, did not live to see the issue of the embittered struggle.

---

[1] Calvin, in his endeavours to suppress the Catholic Church in foreign countries as well, repeatedly demanded that those remaining true to the old faith should be put to the sword. See also the passage quoted by PAULUS (p. 250) in his book *Protestantismus und Toleranz im* 16 *Jahrhundert* (Freiburg, 1911), and also the letter addressed to England in the Corp. Ref., XLI., 81, in which the sentence occurs: All Catholics who will not renounce their superstition, "merentur gladio ultore coerceri, cum non in regem tantum insurgant, sed in Deum ipsum."

Whilst this most violent battle was being fought within the limits of Christendom, the Church was at the same time being threatened by the gravest danger from without by Islam, the inveterate enemy of the name of Christ. The Papacy has a special claim to glory for having, even at this moment of greatest trouble, kept true to its old tradition of being the guardian and shield of Christendom and its civilization against the approach of danger from the east.

Even during the period of the Renaissance the Holy See had preserved the ideal of the Crusades with regard to the increasingly threatening attack of the infidel, and, in proportion to its material power, had done far more towards the repulse of the terrible enemy than any other power in Europe.[1] From Nicholas V. to Paul III. most of the Popes had taken the lead whenever it was a question of protecting or defending Christendom and the civilization of the west against the power of Islam.

The Holy See was the originator and the active supporter of all the coalitions directed against the Turks,[2] while all the attempts to rouse Christendom to a common enterprise against the infidel found in it a warm ally. Even during the stormy period of the apostasy from the faith, Paul III. succeeded in 1538 in forming a league between the Emperor and Venice to avert the Turkish danger. It was only when the powerful maritime Republic concluded a peace with the Porte in 1540, that other grave religious and political troubles arose for the Popes, and drove the thought of the Crusades into the background.[3]

Twenty-five years now passed without any concerted attack having been made by the Christian states upon the enemy in the east. Even during this time, however, Spain and the Knights of Malta had received valuable help from the Holy See in their resistance to the pressure of the Turks in the Mediterranean. Pius IV. shared in the successful repulse of the dangerous Turkish advance on Malta in 1565. The saintly Pius V., in spite of his advanced years, employed all his strength with youthful vigour to secure a victory for the Cross over the Crescent.[1] While the French government maintained its former friendly relations with the Porte, and Elizabeth of England concluded a treaty with the infidels, in the interests of commerce and for the sake of making common cause with them in the struggle against Catholic Spain, the Pope, alone in the midst of a Europe torn asunder by political rivalries and religious hatred, unselfishly kept in view the great purpose of protecting the west and its civilization against the might of Islam.[2] As his ecclesiastical policy reminds us forcibly of the days of the Middle Ages, so do his attempts at a Crusade, a purpose to which he devoted himself with the same fiery zeal as that which once armed the nations of Europe for the deliverance of the Holy Sepulchre. Great as the difficulties were he never lost courage; to realize the dream of Pius II. was his constant aspiration, and he was destined in the end to attain a brilliant success, for, after overcoming indescribable difficulties, he succeeded in uniting such opposing elements as the Spanish King and the Republic of St. Mark in a great combined undertaking against the Turks, and became thereby the saviour of Europe. The glorious victory of Lepanto, which saved southern Europe from being overrun by Islam, and the beautiful basin of the Mediterranean from being transformed into a Turkish lake, and inaugurated the downfall of the fleet of the infidels, till then considered invincible, was his work.

---

[1] See previous volumes of this work.

[2] The opinion of HERRE, Europäische Politik im Cyprischen Krieg, I., Leipsic, 1902, 30.

[3] See Vol. XI. of this work, p. 272.

---

[1] Fachinetti, the nuncio in Venice, says in his report of October 28, 1570: "If the Pope had been a native of Venice, he could not have done more." VALENSISE, Il vescovo di Nicastro poi papa Innocenzo IX. Nicastro, 1898, 88

[2] See E. PEARS in the Eng. Hist. Rev., 1893, No. 31, pp. 439 *seq.*

The jubilation with which the western world received the news of the crushing defeat of the dreaded enemy of Christian civilization, was reflected on the Papacy which was being so violently challenged and insulted by the religious innovators.[1]

Great, however, as were the merits of Pius V. with regard to the repulse of the Turkish danger, and these assure him for ever a place of honour among the Popes, the real significance of his pontificate lies in the sphere of affairs within the Church. Acts of the highest importance, such as the compilation of the Roman Catechism, the reform of the Breviary and Missal, and the Congregation of the Index, are indissolubly associated with his name. But above all, it is as the reformer of ecclesiastical life that he stands out in majestic grandeur. The influence which he exercised over his contemporaries in this direction, both at home and abroad, and on the development of the Church, has been justly described as immeasurable.[2]

That which the noblest spirits had prayed for and ardently desired since the close of the Middle Ages, namely, the reform of the Church in its head and in its members, was accomplished by him with an iron will and a holy zeal which shrank before no difficulties. Everywhere, wherever he found it necessary, he laid his reforming hand, in Germany as in Switzerland, in France as in Poland, but above all in Rome itself. His decrees are more numerous and far-reaching even than those of Paul IV. The Papal court, as well as the whole Curia, was reformed, the Penitentiary completely transformed, and nepotism swept away. The College of Cardinals, the episcopate, the secular clergy, the religious orders both of men and women, and the laity itself, experienced the zeal with which the aged Pontiff carried on his work of reformation.

Whoever investigates the reign of Pius V. in the light of the original documents must come to the conclusion that this Pope was one of those great spirits to whom their own interests are as nothing, but the object for which they are striving is all in all. In his eyes, his temporal sovereignty was of very secondary importance in comparison with his office of supreme pastor of the Church. The renewal of all the faithful in Christ was the only aim he followed ; all worldly and political interests were far from his mind, and the salvation of souls alone filled his heart. Again and again he repeated that he felt responsible before God for the souls of the whole world, and that he must therefore keep in view nothing but the leading back of those who were straying from the truth, the conversion of sinners, and the reformation of the clergy.[1]

---

[1] Instances of such insults outside the time of Pius V. in JANNSEN PASTOR, VI. 15-16, 45 *seq.* *Cf.* also Katholik, 1887, II., 59.

[2] RANKE, Päpste, I., 234, and MÜNTZ, Hist. de l'Art pendant la Renaissance, III., 242, Paris, 1805, agree in this opinion.

Pius V., like the great Popes of the golden age of medieval days, presented to the world the noble spectacle of the successor of St. Peter, amid the appalling dangers threatening them from without, watching over the eternal interests of the new converts in distant lands with the same care as he devoted to the oppressed Catholics in the different countries of Europe. He was indefatigable in sending to the bishops of the Old as well as the New World, apostolic words of admonition and encouragement, in consoling the missionaries as far off as in Abyssinia, and in caring for the newly converted Moors in Spain, as carefully as he looked after the needs of oriental lands. His pastoral love embraced without distinction all the peoples of Europe : Romans and Germans, as well as Slavs. From the height of Peter's throne, he cast the eye of an unwearying shepherd over the whole world, and nothing of importance escaped his sight. Wherever he perceived any deviation from doctrine or ecclesiastical discipline, he intervened to warn or to reprimand, imposing everywhere the strictest standard, and vigorously combating every infringement of ecclesiastical liberty. He greatly valued Philip II. as a supporter of the Church, but that did not prevent him from opposing the national church policy of that egotistical ruler, while he was also capable of making his will and his position effective even in the case of his most faithful and best fellow workers in the cause of reform and renewal. When the legislation of the Jesuits did not appear to him quite to coincide with that of St. Thomas, he at once took decisive steps and changed what his predecessors had allowed. The Capuchin, Pistoja, who was in other respects highly esteemed by the Pope, must have had a painful surprise when he ventured to submit a memorandum concerning matters with which he had nothing to do.[1] Free from every trace of favouritism for persons or institutions, and free from passing moods or unregulated passions, Pius V. weighed all questions solely in accordance with ecclesiastical doctrine and canon law. In all his actions he stood out as the embodiment of the Catholic spirit ; he devoted the revenues of the Apostolic See, which so many of the Renaissance Popes had used for the enrichment of their relatives or for the prosecution of worldly aims, exclusively to the defence of the ancient faith. His reign was in all respects a contrast to the outwardly brilliant but worldly period of the Rovere, Borgia and Medici Popes. This saintly Pontiff, by his simple and ascetic life, made expiation, as it were, for all those points in which his predecessors had been found wanting.

---

[1] See the letter of Pius V. to Philip II. of January 8, 1567, in the Corresp. dipl., ed. SERRANO, II., 7, Madrid, 1914.

Peter Canisius has justly described it as a special dispensation of Divine Providence that in Pius V. a man was sent to the assistance of the Church, who with holy assiduity entered the lists on behalf of the faith, and sought the renovation of Christendom with burning zeal.[2] As a Pontiff whose whole thoughts and aspirations were fixed far beyond earthly interests, on the imperishable blessings of eternity, he begins that line of pious and able Popes, worthy of all reverence, who led the Catholic reformation and restoration from victory to victory. A great part of what was accomplished by his successors, Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V., was a direct consequence of his glorious achievements.

---

[1] He suspended him from saying mass and preaching, " non li parendo conveniente, che questi ch'hanno cura delle cose spirituali, vogliono ancora governare le temporali." *Avviso di Roma, June 14, 1570, Urb. 1041, p. 290b, Vatican Library.

[2] See Canisii Epist., V., 197. *Cf.* Braunsberger, Pius V., 32, Freiburg, 1012.

CHAPTER I.

THE CONCLAVE OF 1559.

THE wild outburst of hatred indulged in by the populace, during the course of which Paul IV. closed his eyes in death on August 18th, 1559, reached its climax and its conclusion in the exciting scenes which took place two days later. The statue of the hated reformer of morals lay in pieces, the coat-of-arms of the Carafa was everywhere torn down, and the prisons of the demolished buildings of the Inquisition lay empty.[1] On the morning of the 21st the fury of the people

---

[1] See Vol. XIV. of this work, pp. 414 seqq. The quantity of original matter concerning the vacancy in the Papal throne and the conclave of Pius IV. is very great. The most important sources are: (1) The Diary of Ludovicus Bondonus de Branchis Firmanus (in MERKLE, II., 518-31), who was present in the conclave as Master of the Ceremonies (MERKLE, cx). (2) Antonius Guidus, De obitu Pauli IV., et conclavi cum electione Pii IV. (MERKLE, II., 605-32); Guido was in the conclave, probably as conclavist of Cardinal Gonzaga (*ibid.*, cxxxv). *Cf.* also ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 165-6. (3) Onuphrius Panvinius, De creatione Pii IV. Papae (MERKLE, II., 575-601). Panvinio first entered the conclave December 24, 1559 (*ibid.*, cxxvi., 577), and was therefore an eye-witness of the closing scenes. Merkle gives extracts from a second edition of Panvinio in the annotations, p. 332 *seqq.* (4) The *Lists of the scrutinies collected by Panvinio in the Court Library, Munich (see Appendix, No. 1).

Besides these we have the exceedingly copious diplomatic reports and correspondence. (1) the reports of the Spanish ambassador, Francisco de Vargas to Philip II. from September 27 to December 29, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 265-328. Other sources from Simancas in MÜLLER, Konklave Pius IV., and HINOJOSA, Felipe II. y el conclave de 1559, Madrid, 1889. (2) Reports from the French side in RIBIER, II., 824-42. *Cf.* the account of a French Cardinal made use of by RUBLE (Le traité de seemed to be appeased, and quiet was once more restored in the city.

There was, however, still no lack of less violent manifestations against the hated Carafa. Ascanio della Corgna, who had been forced to fly before the anger of Paul IV.,[1] returned

---

Cateau-Cambrésis, 100 *seq.*, Paris, 1889. (3) The correspondence from the archives of the Dukes of Florence and Ferrara (Modena) used by PETRUCELLI, II., 119-70, and by ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 123 *seqq.* (4) extracts from the correspondence of Ferdinand I. and his ambassador in Rome, Francis von Thurm, in SICKEL, Konzil, 1-14, in S. BRUNNER in the Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner-und Zisterzienserorden, VI., 2 (1885), 173-8, 387-99, and in WAHRMUND, Ausschlieszungsrecht, 82-6, 257-65. (5) The *letter to the Duchess of Urbino, probably written by the confessor of Card. Giulio della Rovere (Vat. 7039, Vatican Library, and State Library, Vienna, 6012) first used by DEMBIŃSKI, p. 292. (6) The *reports of the Mantuan agents in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, which are for the first time made use of in the present work.

The importance of this long conclave also appears clearly in the great number of monographs devoted to it. The most noteworthy of these is the work composed in the Polish language by DEMBINSKI, Wybór Piusa IV., from archival material from Florence, Vienna and Rome, published in the transactions of the Cracow Academy, XX. (1887), 190-304; this had remained unknown to all German investigators of the conclave. MÜLLER'S book, Das Konklaves Pius' IV., 1559, Gotha, 1889, is very thorough, but he knows nothing of the treatise used by Dembinski. Šusta has, however, made use of it in his monograph (Pius IV.) written in the Czech language, which deals at considerable length with the vacancy and the conclave (pp. 100-52). Šusta has unfortunately not been taken any notice of in any of the later descriptions of the conclave. Of these the following are worthy of mention: RUBLE, *loc. cit.* (often insufficient, see ANCEL, Disgrâce, 66; DEMBIŃSKI, Rzym, I., 237 *seq.*); WAHRMUND, Ausschlieszungsrecht, 77-88; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 46-109; HERRE, Papstum und Papstwahlen 33-64; EISLER, Veto bei der Papstwahl, 52 *seq.*; RIESS, Politik Pauls, IV., 379-98.

[1] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. p. 133, of this work.

from banishment on August 21st, and was again able to appear in the streets of Rome as a prince. Marcantonio Colonna, who had been declared an outlaw by the dead Pope, and compelled to forfeit his estates in favour of Giovanni Carafa,[1] likewise reappeared in the Eternal City on August 21st. The people went to meet him, and received him with the liveliest signs of joy. Colonna had regained all his former possessions, with the exception of Paliano, but he assured the Cardinals on August 22nd that he was prepared to obey the commands of the future Pope.[2]

The supreme senate of the Church also allowed it to be clearly seen that it was not in all matters of one mind with its deceased head. Cardinal Morone was, to the great satisfaction of the whole court,[3] released from his prison in the Castle of St. Angelo, in accordance with the decision of the majority of the Sacred College, and, contrary to the decree of Paul IV.,[4] he also received back the passive right of election in the approaching conclave.[5] The Cardinals dealt otherwise with Alfonso Carafa. This prelate, whom his uncle had appointed President of the Apostolic Camera, and, as such, had given him equal rights with the Cardinal Camerlengo[1] during the time of the vacancy in the Holy See, found that he could make no use of these rights. At his first attempt to do so, he met with strong opposition from the Cardinal Camerlengo, Sforza, of whose opposition the Sacred College fully approved.[2] It was Sforza, too, a violent opponent of the Carafa, who on August 23rd read to the assembled Cardinals a letter of Ascanio della Corgna, containing bitter accusations against the late Pope and his nephews,[3] and it would seem that not a single voice was raised in favour of the Pontiff who had barely closed his eyes in death.

---

[1] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, pp. 100, 105, 111, 121, 167.

[2] Panvinius in MERKLE, II., 335 n. 2., MASSARELLI, *ibid.*, 336; GUIDUS, *ibid.*, 608. *Report of G. Aldrovandi dated Rome, August 23, 1559 (State Archives, Bologna).

[3] G. Aldrovandi lays emphasis on this in the above mentioned *report of August 23.

[4] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, pp. 302 *seq.*

[5] BONDONUS, 518; Panvinius in MERKLE, II., 334 n. According to MASSARELLI, 334, Morone was set at liberty on August 20. This is, however, incorrect. In the codex of the Seminary Library, Foligno, the importance of which is made clear by our remarks in Vol. XIV., p. 468, of this work, the note is written on the margin of the statement of opinion of A. Massa, p. 115, that "die lunae 21 Augusti secundum hanc informationem" was fixed as the day that Morone was to be set at liberty, and the work was at once set on foot. Thirteen of the Cardinals were in favour of his being freed, and eleven against it (PANVINIUS, 334), Puteo was among the latter on formal grounds; see ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 112, n. 2.

A fresh incentive was given to the hatred against the Carafa when, just at this moment, news was spread of the shocking occurrences which had taken place in the family of the Duke of Paliano. Giovanni Carafa had, on the confession, under torture, of a supposed paramour of his wife, killed him with twenty-seven thrusts of a dagger. On August 29th the wretched wife followed her supposed seducer into death; in spite of her pregnancy, she was strangled by her own brother and another relative. The Roman people saw in this family tragedy a Divine judgment on the Duke, who had had so little reverence for the honour of women.[4]

Under such circumstances, a speech which Ascanio della Corgna made on the Capitol on August 30th against the Carafa[5] was bound to make a doubly deep impression. On the following day, August 31st, a popular vote declared the whole of the Carafa family, with the exception of the two Cardinals, deprived of their civil rights as Roman citizens, and begged, in the presence of the former mighty Carlo Carafa, permission of the Sacred College to drive the Duke of Paliano, Giovanni

---

[1] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 216.

[2] GUIDUS, 607; MASSARELLI, 336.

[3] Panvinius in MERKLE, II., 335, n. 2.

[4] *Cf.* *Avviso di Roma dated August 12, 1559 (Urb. 1038, p. 69b, Vatican Library). See details concerning this case *infra* cap. IV.

[5] Panvinius in MERKLE, II., 337.

Carafa, and his family out of his towns of Gallese and Soriano and from all the States of the Church.[1]

This arrogant demand was received with indignation by the Cardinals. When Pirro Taro, the Conservator of the city, again appeared on September 1st, with the representatives of the people, to receive the answer to their request, Cardinal Carpi, in the absence of the Dean, du Bellay, gave them a severe reprimand on account of the recent excesses, and, at the same time, he forbade them to take any proceedings on their own authority, and, in fatherly terms, gravely admonished them to keep the peace, and to think of the public weal. Taro, in his reply, sought to make excuses for the people by expatiating on the burdens of the war and the heavy taxes during the late pontificate, and the encroachments of the Carafa.[2] The College of Cardinals had already taken the part of the Carafa family when Count Giovanni Francesco Bagno had attempted to take possession of the little town of Montebello, of which he had been deprived by Paul IV. in favour of Antonio Carafa; on August 26th the Cardinals had forbidden the Duke of Florence to afford any assistance to Count Bagno.[3] However, all the signs of favour, as well as of hostility, which the Carafa family received, were of little account in comparison with the fact that, in virtue of a decree of the Sacred College, Carlo Carafa was recalled from banishment and again put in possession of all the rights of a Cardinal. In view of the mere fact of the great number of his adherents, the prediction of the French ambassador in Venice that Cardinal Carafa would play but an unimportant part in the coming conclave,[4] appeared to be altogether illusory.

The regulation of the canon law that after the death of a Pope the nine days obsequies should be commenced at once, and be followed on the tenth day by the opening of the conclave, was once more not exactly observed on this occasion. The solemn services for the repose of the soul of Paul IV. were only begun on August 23rd, and lasted, with breaks on the intervening Sundays and holidays,[1] till September 4th. On the following day, after the Mass of the Holy Ghost and the usual sermon, preached on this occasion by the well-known humanist, Giulio Pogiano,[2] the Cardinals went into the Vatican for the conclave,[3] although no one had the least idea that this was to last for three months and twenty-one days.

---

[1] GUIDUS, 609. *Report of Camillo Capilupi dated Rome, Sept. 2, 1559 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[2] GUIDUS, 610. *Report of C. Capilupi of Sept. 2, 1559 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] GUIDUS, 609.

[4] François de Noailles to the Cardinal of Lorraine, August 1, 1559. RIBIER, II., 825.

Many of the Cardinals who were not present in Rome arrived in the Eternal City[4] even before the conclusion of the obsequies, so that on the morning of September 5th thirty-five voters, and on the evening of the same day, yet another five were able to repair to the conclave[5]; Armagnac and Capizuchi remained in the city on account of illness.[6] After the beginning of the election proceedings several more Cardinals arrived in Rome. The original number of forty electors had been increased by September 28th to forty-seven,[1] but by October 12th it had fallen to forty-four,[2] in consequence of illness, though it had risen to forty-eight[3] by the 31st of the month. Capodiferro died on December 1st, and Dandino on the 4th, while du Bellay and Saraceni returned to the city on the advice of their physicians.[4] At the actual election, therefore, only forty-four voters took part. Seven Cardinals remained absent from the conclave altogether; these were, beside the Spaniard Mendoza and the Portuguese Prince Henry, the five Frenchmen, Givry, Vendôme, Odet de Châtillon, Meudon, who died in November, and Charles of Lorraine who, with his brother Francis, was acting as Regent for the king, who was a minor. Cardinal Consiglieri had died on August 25th.[5]

---

[1] On August 25, 27 and 29, and Sept. 3 (PANVINIUS, 336 *seqq.*). A payment for "Michele Grecco Luchese pittore per pitture per le esequie di Paolo IV," is entered on August 21 in the *Conto delli Olgiati depositarii de denari spesi in sede vacante di Paolo IV. (State Archives, Rome).

[2] BONDONUS, 518. The oration is printed in POGIANI Epistulae, I., 310 *seq.*

[3] See the plan of the conclave (contemporary print of A. Bladus) in the Papal Secret Archives, XI., 122 (also in the State Archives, Florence, C. Strozz., I., 229, see SUSTA, Pius IV., 116).

[4] On August 18, Carlo Carafa, on the 21, Corgna, on the 24, du Bellay and Crispi, on the 25, Alessandro Farnese and Simoncelli, on the 28, Rovere, on the 29, Cicada, Innocenzo del Monte, Gaddi and Armagnac, on the 30, Mercurio (Mamertinus, *cf.* MERKLE, II., 628, 38). Cristoforo del Monte, Madruzzo and Este, on the 31, Gonzaga; on an unknown date, Lenoncourt and Capodiferro. Panvinius in MERKLE, 335-7.

[5] Namely Cueva, Medici, Cristoforo del Monte, Ricci and Capodiferro. Panvinius, *loc. cit.*, 339 n.

[6] *Ibid.*

In order to maintain public order 400 men had been levied for the defence of the Capitol by the magistrates, on August 23rd, and on the 24th 3,000 additional soldiers and 300 cavalry were appointed to guard the city.[6]

Long before the beginning of the conclave attention had been directed to the approaching Papal election from many different quarters. Paul IV. had especially sought to exclude two Cardinals from attaining to the supreme dignity; the highly respected Cardinal Morone, whose faith, in the opinion of the Pope, was not above suspicion, and the wealthy Cardinal Ippolito d'Este, who had great experience in everything connected with diplomacy, but who was completely unworthy.

---

[1] Armagnac arrived on September 7, on the 8, Tournon, on the 11, Truchsess, on the 14, Strozzi and Guise, on the 18, Ranuccio Farnese, on the 28, Capizuchi. BONDONUS, 519 *seqq.*

[2] On September 20, Armagnac left the conclave, Capizuchi on October 2, and Simoncelli on the 12. BONDONUS, 519 *seqq.*

[3] By the arrival of Bertrand on October 25, and the return of Simoncelli, Armagnac and Capizuchi on October 20, 30, and 31. BONDONUS, 524 *seqq.*

[4] *Ibid.*, 526 *seqq.* Capodiferro died in the conclave, and Dandino, who had left it on December 1, in the city.

[5] MASSARELLI, 335; BONDONUS, 518.

[6] GUIDUS, 609.

In his decrees concerning the Papal election, Paul IV. had especially these two Cardinals in mind,[1] and when he had Morone arrested and Este banished[2] he was in no small degree led to this step by the fear that one of them might reach the Papal throne.[3] He detested Este on account of his simoniacal attempts to gain possession of the tiara. He had even attacked the Cardinal of Ferrara, declaring him to be a Simon Magus,[4] in the very conclave from which he came forth as Pope, and on the second anniversary of his election he admonished the Cardinals to allow God to appoint the Pope, and not to choose one who had bills of exchange to the value of from 100,000 to 200,000 scudi in his pocket, and could grant benefices worth from 50,000 to 60,000 scudi, like that Simon Magus whom they all knew.[5] At the same time Paul IV.'s own nephew, Cardinal Carafa, was secretly working, with French support, even during his uncle's lifetime, for the elevation of Este.[6]

The Cardinal of Ferrara had already been the candidate of France at three Papal elections,[7] and after the death of Paul IV. he was more than ever certain, to continue to be so, as he was connected by marriage with the most powerful French statesmen, the family of Guise.[8] He himself strove with great energy to attain the Papal dignity, although he had small prospect of success, on account of his unworthiness.[9] His boundless riches, the favour of the princes, and the splendour of his illustrious family were all as much in his favour as his personal qualities. According to Guidus he was possessed of a truly terrible vigilance, of incredible persistence, and had besides an unusual charm of manner, which won for him all he desired.[1] In order not to injure his own prospects he was clever enough to arrange that only those Cardinals should be put forward as candidates of whose election there was no possible chance, and, on the other hand, that those who enjoyed the favour of many supporters should remain in the background. It was he who was chiefly responsible for the long duration of the conclave.

---

[1] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 220.

[2] *Ibid*, pp. 101, 289.

[3] *Ibid*, pp. 291, 302 *seq.*

[4] Panvinius in MERKLE, II., 268, col. 1.

[5] Navagero on May 29, 1557, in BROWN, VI., 2, n. 907, p. 1123 *seq.*; *cf.* Navagero on March 20, 1557, *ibid*, VI., 3. App. n. 159., p. 1659.

[6] Navagero on May 30, 1556, in BROWN, IV., 1, n. 500.

[7] *Cf.* Vols. XIII., p. 20, XIV. pp. 2, 57, of this work.

[8] *Cf.* Lettres de Catherine de Médicis, I., 123 *seq.*

[9] *" La notte seguente (September 17) Ferrara cominciò a esser dietro alle sue prattiche gagliardamente e per tutto il giorno seguente non restò di tempestare benchè ogn'homo conoscessi l'impossibilità " (enclosure in cypher). Thus Francesco di

The French government wished Cardinal Tournon to be the next Pope, should Este's election not be possible, and after him, Cardinal Gonzaga; there were, besides, several other Cardinals, such as Pisani, Armagnac, and du Bellay, who would not have been displeasing to the French. Carpi, on the other hand, was to be absolutely barred as a candidate.[2] It was feared that he would, as Pope, endeavour to get back the lost principality of Carpi for his family, and thus give rise to political complications.[3] In other respects, France no longer had the same interest in the election as on former occasions. After the death of Henry II., on July 10th, 1559, Francis II., who was a minor, had ascended the throne, and the regency of the two Guise brothers had to contend with such difficulties in their own country that, for the time being,

---

Guadagno to the Duke of Mantua on September 20, 1559 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). "Ferrara no entra en el juego, sino es en contradecir a Carpo." Vargas to Philip II. on September 28, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 269. Concerning Este *cf.* Requesens to Philip II., on January 5, 1665, *ibid.*, 582.

[1] GUIDUS, 622.

[2] Francis II. to his ambassador in Rome on August 27, 1559, in RIBIER, II., 830.

[3] MÜLLER, 60. Fr. v. Thurm to King Ferdinand on November 3, 1559, in WAHRMUND, 260: "timet Carpensem Ferrariensis propter jura, quae super oppido Carpi praetendit." Carpi lost his principality as early as 1527.

France could not think of new conquests in Italy. In addition to this, French statesmen had come to the conclusion, since the last Franco-Spanish war, that it would be much better for France to give up the policy of seeking for territory in Italy.[1] The instructions for the French ambassador in Rome, accordingly, were to the effect that if none of the proposed candidates could be pushed through, it would be well to support someone else, irrespective of nationality, provided that he were worthy of the dignity, and free from ambition.[2]

Spain, too, no longer thought of conquests in Italy. The aims of Philip II. were to preserve peace in his own dominions, and to strengthen the Catholic Church against the new doctrines, and, if only for the latter reason, he was deeply interested as to who should obtain the tiara. When Philip appointed Don Juan de Figueroa as his ambassador in Rome, shortly after the war with Paul IV., he impressed upon his envoy that his most important task would be his procedure at the next Papal election.[3] However anxious Philip may have been that no one should be elected to the Papal throne who would begin a new war with Spain, Figueroa was nevertheless instructed not to endeavour, in the first place, to gain influence in the conclave in any political sense or from a political point of view. The king was much more anxious to have a Pope " who would be zealous for the service of God, and for the well-being and pacification of Christendom, who would eradicate religious errors and disputes, and prevent their spread, and who would devote himself to the urgently-needed work of reform, and who would preserve Christendom, and especially Italy, which had been so sorely tried by the war, in peace and unity." Should a candidate possess all these qualities, then his readiness to represent the actual interests of Spain was not to weigh too much in the balance. As desirable candidates Philip then indicated Carpi, Morone, Puteo, Medici and Dolera. Morone and Dolera, who had only recently been elevated to the cardinalate, had little prospect of being elected, and were only mentioned out of courtesy. Este and all Frenchmen were to be excluded.[1]

---

[1] MÜLLER, 32.

[2] So writes Francesco di Guadagno to the Duke of Mantua, Rome, September, 16, 1559: *" Giovedi (September 14) sera entrorno in conclavi li rev^{mi} Ghisa et Strozzi, con ordine, dicono, di non havere rispetto ne a Francesi ne a Imperiali ma solo a far un homo da bene et che sia atto a tal carico." (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] *Instruction for Figueroa on September 25, 1559 (Simancas Archives). Extract in MÜLLER, 84.

As far as Figueroa was concerned, these instructions had no importance, since Paul IV. would not accept him as ambassador on account of a former interference on his part in the rights of the Inquisition.[2] When at length the Pope was willing to receive him, and Philip repeated his orders in an Instruction of July 13th, 1559,[3] Figueroa died on July 28th, 1559, at Gaeta. The king then appointed Francisco de Vargas, his former representative in Milan. He sailed from Antwerp on August 31st, and reached Rome on September 25th.[4] Figueroa's instructions were also to be followed by him, although he applied them in a much more arbitrary manner.

Count Francis von Thurm,[5] hitherto the representative of Ferdinand, King of the Romans, in Venice, arrived in Rome on August 28th as his ambassador. In this office, Thurm can hardly be said to have represented an independent policy,[6] but rather to have followed that of Vargas.[7]

---

[1] MÜLLER, 84 *seq.* There appears no reason to doubt Philip's sincerity, HERRE, 33 *seq. Cf.* also ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 79.

[2] MÜLLER, 40 *seq.*

[3] MÜLLER, 85; *cf.* 59, n. 1. As to the date see HERRE, 41, n. 1.

[4] MÜLLER, 41; Concerning Vargas see CONSTANT, Rapport, 186 *seq.*

[5] Concerning him see CONSTANT, Rapport, 2 *seq.*

[6] Ferdinand remarked that he had never directly (liberamente) proposed anyone to the conclave, but only expressed a wish, "che eleggano un homo da bene." Giacomo Soranzo on December 2, 1559, in TURBA, III., 125 n.

[7] SICKEL, Konzil, 1 *seqq.* S. BRUNNER in Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner-und Zisterzienserorden, VI., 2 (1885), 173 *seqq.*

Duke Cosimo of Florence, on the other hand, secretly endeavoured to obtain a great influence over the proceedings of the conclave. It was not enough for him that his two envoys, Bongianni Gianfigliazzi and Matteo Concini, were present in Rome, but he also sent Bartolomeo Concini there, who was initiated into all the secrets of his policy. Two of his agents, one of them the adroit Lottino, were admitted to the conclave as supposed attendants on Cardinals.[1] Cosimo tried himself to win over the electors to his plans by letters, and not everyone had the courage, like Cardinal Dandino, to reject these letters,[2] or to answer, like Cardinal Scotti, that the Duke should attend to the affairs of his dominions and leave the Papal election to the Cardinals.[3] For some years the Medici family had been connected by marriage with that of Este, and it is easy to understand that Cardinal d'Este should now have sought to approach the Duke, and that this ambitious Prince of the Church should have endeavoured to win over this powerful ally to the support of his long-cherished designs on the tiara. Cosimo pretended to accept his proposals, but his concurrence was not sincere.[4] He also promised his assistance to the Queen-Mother, Catherine de' Medici, when she begged for his support for Este, but at the same time he offered his services to the Spanish king against the Cardinal,[5] and, as a matter of fact, in the conclave he left Este in the lurch and worked directly against him.[1] According to Cosimo's view, Cardinal de' Medici was, as a matter of course, the only possible candidate,[2] but this preference, which was well known in the conclave from the first, rather prejudiced than helped the Cardinal in the eyes of many, for a Pope who had at his command the whole influence of the powerful Florentine Duke was to be dreaded.[3] Cosimo, however, refrained from openly influencing the Cardinals during October and November; it was only towards the end of the conclave that he interfered decisively.

---

[1] ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 127. MÜLLER, 62 *seq.*

[2] PETRUCELLI, 144.

[3] *Avviso di Roma of September 9, 1559 (Urb. 1030, p. 79, Vatican Library).

[4] Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga of Mantua, with whom Este had entered into an alliance for mutual support even before the conclave of Marcellus II., also appears to have been a party to the agreement; there is reason to believe that a formal compact was even made, according to which the Duke and Gonzaga were to work for the candidature of Este, while the Duke and Este were to render a similar service to Gonzaga. Should, however, neither of the said Cardinals gain the tiara, they were all three to promote the candidature of Medici. These very conditional promises were, from the nature of such transactions, of very little value. MÜLLER, 55 *seq.*

[5] MÜLLER, 63 *seq.*; *cf.* also ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 142 *seq.*

The peculiar party conditions existing among the electors made it possible for diplomacy to play an important part in the election, to an even greater extent than was usually the case. It is to be ascribed to the confusion and the obstacles which were constantly being raised in this way that the Papal throne remained unoccupied for more than four months. The Cardinals were divided into three almost equal parties. The French interests were under the skilful direction of Cardinals Ippolito d'Este of Ferrara and Louis de Guise, and were represented by Cardinals Tournon, du Bellay, Armagnac,

---

[1] MÜLLER, 57, 62.

[2] Cosimo to Concini on September 21, 1559, in PETRUCELLI, 129. "Quelli che più di tutti sono in predicamento per il giudicio comune sono Carpi, Puteo, Morone et Medeghino," wrote Fra Taddeo Perugino to the Archbishop of Salerno as early as August 25, 1559 (SUSTA, Pius IV., 123). Navagero recognised Medici as the candidate most likely to be successful as early as 1558 (see ALBÈRI, I., 3, 413).

[3] *" Medici è molto favorito dal Duca di Firenze, il cui favore in luogo di giovamento gli noce (*cf.* the statement in SUSTA, Pius IV., 127, n. 2), perchè la grandezza di quel Duca è molto temuta di tutta questa corte et si dubita che havendo un papa creatura sua et tanto più della natura di Medici che sarebbe troppo grande." Capilupi on September 2, 1559 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Concerning Puteo Capilupi writes that he was held "in molta consideratione" in spite of the hostility of Este and Farnese.

Lenoncourt, Bertrand and Strozzi; the Italians Pisani, Cesi, Cristoforo del Monte, Simoncelli and Sermoneta for the most part adhered to this party, and to a less reliable degree, Crispi, Capodiferro and Dandino.[1] To these sixteen French partisans were opposed seventeen adherents of Spain. Their leader was Ascanio Sforza di Santa Fiora, as well as the Bishop of Trent, Cristoforo Madruzzo. These two were followed by Truchsess, Cueva, Pacheco, Carpi, Morone, Puteo, Ricci, Corgna, Mercurio, Cornaro, Cicada, Saraceni, Medici, Gonzaga and Rovere.[2]

According to the person put forward as candidate, these party relations were more or less altered, but each of the two parties was strong enough to prevent the election of an undesirable candidate, although neither could of itself produce the necessary majority of two-thirds of the votes. The decision lay therefore with a third party, that of Cardinal Carlo Carafa. The thirteen Cardinals created by the deceased Pope, with the exception of Strozzi and Bertrand, all belonged to it, that is to say, the two relatives of Paul IV., Alfonso and Diomede Carafa, the three members of religious orders in the Sacred College, the Dominican Ghislieri, the Franciscan Dolera, and the Theatine Scotti, and, in addition, Rebiba, Capizuchi, Reumano, Gaddi and Vitelli. All these were thoroughly ecclesiastically-minded men, which made it all the more surprising that they should have allied themselves to such an unworthy person as Carlo Carafa. The party of the Carafa was also soon strengthened by Alessandro Farnese and his three adherents, his brother Ranuccio Farnese, Savelli and Innocenzo del Monte.[3]

A letter written in October, 1559, by the Duke of Paliano, is characteristic of the position of the Carafa family at the election. "It is not of the least consequence," writes Giovanni Carafa to his brother, "who will be Pope, the only thing that is of importance is that he who is chosen should realize that he owes the dignity to the Carafa. This house does not enjoy any favour with the Spanish or French kings, and everything therefore depends on securing the favour of the future Pope, as otherwise the ruin of the family is assured."[1] Carlo Carafa had completely broken with the French at the beginning of the conclave, and was inclined to favour the Spaniards. He, as well as his nephew, the Cardinal of Naples, entered the conclave with the idea of voting for Carpi, or, should his election prove impossible, for Gonzaga.[2] As a reward for his services in the conclave Carlo Carafa expected to receive from Philip II. an Italian principality, which would compensate his family for the forfeited Paliano.

---

[1] Müller, 70 *seqq.*

[2] *Ibid.*, 76 *seqq.*

[3] *Ibid.*, 90 *seqq.* A. Farnese assures the king of his devotion in letters of September 4 and 5, which are addressed to Ardinghello in Spain. After the election he justified his conduct in the conclave to the Spanish king, and excused himself at the French court. Caro, III., 265 *seqq.*, 273 *seqq.*

Carafa's chief adviser was Alessandro Farnese, who had already taken part in three conclaves, and had acquired a great deal of experience. Even before the death of Paul IV. Carafa had addressed himself to Farnese, from Cività Lavinia, his place of banishment, and placed himself and the thirteen votes of the Cardinals created by the late Pope at his disposal for the approaching conclave; with their united efforts they intended to elevate a Cardinal who would show himself grateful to the houses of Farnese and Carafa for his election.[3] Farnese did not appear to take a prominent part in the conclave, but in spite of this, his influence as an adviser seems to have been very important, and it was especially he who "with incredible skill and trouble"[4] held the Carafa party together at a critical moment.

Among the forty electors who entered the conclave on September 5th, only eleven favoured the French. The opposing party therefore thought to make use of their majority at once on the evening of the following day, by electing Cardinal Carpi as Pope, by paying him general homage and without having recourse to formal voting, thus bringing the conclave to a speedy conclusion.[1] This plan came to nothing owing to the disunion of the Spanish party. Their leader, Sforza, was secretly opposed to Carpi, even though he was the principal candidate of the Spaniards, and had allowed himself to be drawn into a secret agreement by Este, by which he promised to prevent Carpi's election, while Este was to work on behalf of Medici or Gonzaga, who both also belonged to the Spanish party.[2]

---

[1] ANCEL, Disgrâce, 66 *seq.*

[2] Alfonso Carafa, the Cardinal of Naples, *writes to this effect to his father, the Marquis of Montebello, on October 11, 1559 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] PANVINIUS, 576-7.

[4] "incredibili arte et labore"; *ibid.*, 580.

The attempt, therefore, to elevate Carpi suddenly was bound to be unsuccessful, and they had to content themselves with allowing the conclave to proceed in the usual manner. The customary election capitulation was drawn up and read aloud on the evening of September 8th.[3] It contained, besides the declarations constantly recurring in such documents, distinct allusions to the pontificate of the late Pope. The Cardinals, accordingly, had to swear that they would undertake no war, and that they would punish in a fitting manner the outbreaks which had taken place while the proceedings in connection with the vacancy in the Papal throne were being conducted. The reform of the Church and the Curia, as well as the carrying on of the Council, was also earnestly enjoined on the Cardinal who should be elected.[4] On September 9th the bull of Julius II. was sworn to.[5]

---

[1] BONDONUS, 519.

[2] Conclavi de' Pontifici Romani, s.l. 1667, 160 *seqq.* The report of the "Conclavi" is supported by statements in trustworthy sources (MÜLLER, 110 *seq.*). Sermoneta declared himself very decidedly against Carpi; see **Caligari's letter of September 12, 1559 (Papal Secret Archives).

[3] BONDONUS, 519.

[4] DEMBIŃSKI, Wybór Piusa IV., 289-304, in the extract in RAYNALDUS, 1559, n. 37 *seq.* LE PLAT, IV., 612 *seq.* *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 12 *seq.*, and the analysis in MÜLLER, 100 *seq.* See also Quellen und Forschungen des Preuss. Instit., XII., 226.

[5] BONDONUS, 519.

On the same day the voting began, but at first, at any rate, was not taken seriously. Este wrote on the 11th that they were not as yet thinking seriously of getting a Pope elected, and that there was hardly anyone as yet who would allow himself to be voted for.[1] The want of unanimity and decision in the conclave was so great that a large number of aspirants, some twenty or more, could flatter themselves with hopes of receiving the tiara.[2] The Spanish party also thought it well to wait for further indications of the wishes of Philip II. It therefore frequently happened in the early days of the conclave that a considerable number of votes were given to a Cardinal whom no one seriously wished to become Pope, for the sole purpose of showing him honour. On September 11th Cueva received seventeen votes, on the 13th Lenoncourt had eighteen, on the 14th the Cardinal-Infante of Portugal had fifteen and five *accessits*.[3] In the case of Cueva they very narrowly escaped an unpleasant surprise. The Imperial ambassador had been collecting votes for him, so that at length thirty-two Cardinals had given him their promise as a joke, and without realizing the importance of their action. Cueva would have been elected Pope, against the will of the whole conclave, had not a fortunate chance revealed the mistake shortly before the decisive moment.[4] There was great excitement during the night of September 24th when a similar danger came to light. Cornaro had obtained for his uncle, Pisani, the only Cardinal of Leo X. who was still alive, the votes of thirty-seven electors, though, when the matter threatened to become serious, they withdrew their promises.[1]

---

[1] PETRUCELLI, 132 *seq.*

[2] MÜLLER, 109. Müller counts 14 Cardinals "whose candidature had been seriously mentioned." *Scoperti 19 che tutti si stimano papabili, il che mette discordi et controversia grande fra loro. Avviso di Roma of September 16, 1559 (Urb. 1039, p. 83b, Vatican Library).

[3] See the *List of scrutinies (State Library, Munich) in Appendix No. 1. GUIDUS, 612; BONDONUS, 519 *seq.* Bondonus gives 18 votes to Cueva. According to the *Avviso di Roma of September 16, 1559 (Urb. 1039, p, 83b), he had had 17 and 7 *accessits*, "e se per caso Ferrara non scopriva la tram' a Farnese, lui riusciva papa" (Vatican Library).

[4] GUIDUS, 612 *seq.* Vargas, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 266-7.

Several more seriously intended attempts and proposals were made during the first weeks of the conclave by the Spanish party, but their very endeavours clearly showed to what straits they were reduced in order to find a candidate against whom no objection could be raised. At the beginning of the voting Pacheco was the most prominent, having received fifteen votes[2] at the first scrutiny and a still greater number after September 22nd.[3] Pacheco, however, was a Spaniard, and the Italian Cardinals did not wish for him as Pope on that account. After him Puteo received most votes in the early days, but he had, as later events showed, the powerful party of the Carafa against him.[4] Carpi, after the futile attempt of September 6th, fell into the background at the scrutinies in a marked way, so that of the Spanish candidates there only remained Medici, whom Duke Cosimo repeatedly and emphatically described as the only possible candidate.[5] Since 1556 he had had the election of this man, in whom he hoped to find an accommodating tool for his political plans, in view, and had been secretly working for him,[6] and now he championed him almost too openly.[7] Medici was supported by Philip II., the Queen-Mother, Catherine de' Medici, also showing herself, against all expectations, to be well disposed towards him.[1] In the conclave Farnese and the Carafa favoured him,[2] while the French had no objection to his being elected. From the very beginning of the election proceedings, Medici was treated by his colleagues with such distinction that his elevation to the Papal throne was expected on the evening of September 9th,[3] but he had a dangerous opponent in the powerful and cunning Este, who distrusted him on account of his favourable prospects, and who would not renounce his own candidature, however unlikely it may have appeared; his aim was to prolong the conclave, the better to gain time for his intrigues. On September 16th and the following Sunday there was active canvassing for Medici.[4] In order to bring pressure to bear on Este in favour of Medici, Farnese acted as though he wished to support Carpi, his most dreaded opponent. Consequently Carpi, who in the first week of the conclave had managed to get at most five or six votes, received all of a sudden fourteen and sixteen.[5] On the afternoon of September 20th it was generally believed that the idea of his elevation by general homage was really intended, many of the Cardinals assembling together, as if with this purpose, in the Pauline Chapel. His opponents, however, were also present, and persisted in remaining far into the night, so that Carpi's favourable prospects again disappeared.[6]

---

[1] GUIDUS, 613 *seq.*

[2] *List of the scrutinies (State Library, Munich) in Appendix No. 1.

[3] *Ibid.*, and BONDONUS, 520 *seq.*

[4] MÜLLER, 141 *seq.*

[5] See the letter to Concini of September 21, 1559, quoted *supra* p. 13, n. 2, and that to Lottino of September 24, 1559, in ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 125.

[6] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 66 *seq.*, 76 *seqq.*

[7] *Cf.* the **Letter of Caligari of September 12, 1559 (Papal Secret Archives).

---

[1] *Avviso di Roma of September 23, 1559; "Ma si ragiona, che Medici habbia d'esser propost' a tutti per li molti favori, che li sono sopragionti contra l'opinione di tutti della Regina di Franza." (Urb. 1039, p. 85, Vatican Library).

[2] *Cf.* the **Letter of Caligari of September 12, 1559 (Papal Secret Archives).

[3] *Avviso di Roma of September 9, 1559, *loc. cit.*, p. 79.

[4] Guadagno on September 20 to the Duke of Mantua; see Appendix No. 2.

[5] *List of the scrutinies (State Archives, Munich) in Appendix No. 1.

[6] BONDONUS, 520. *Guadagno to the Duke of Mantua on September 20, 1559 (see Appendix No. 2). Guadagno expressly states what Müller (p. 114) only calls a conjecture, that the whole scene was staged only to make an impression on Este: "Farnese per paura la sera fece mezo segno di voler andare ad adorare Carpi per far risolvere Ferrara."

The Spaniards, however, could not this time put forward their most able man, Morone.[1] As was currently reported in Rome, the Cardinals in the conclave had once more investigated Morone's case, and this had resulted in an acquittal. When, on the suggestion of Carafa, Vitelli allowed himself to raise an objection, saying that he had on the preceding day carefully studied Morone's case and had found many remarkable things in it, he received a sharp answer from Carpi, in which he was supported by Gonzaga.[2] Morone, nevertheless, resolved to make a declaration to the College of Cardinals on September 17th, through the Dean, du Bellay, thanking them for their decision in his case, and for their efforts on his behalf with Paul IV. and the princes. As, however, several persons were not willing to see him take part in the election, he begged them to permit him to withdraw from the conclave. Du Bellay would not grant this request, and as the majority of the Cardinals persisted in their decision of acquittal, Morone withdrew his proposal; this unselfishness on his part did not fail to increase the esteem in which he was held.[3]

After the endeavours of the Spanish party had proved unavailing, the French made an attempt to elevate the esteemed and generally respected Cardinal Tournon. It is true that the Italians did not wish for a Frenchman, but many promised a vote of honour, and therefore Tournon received, for the scrutiny of September 22nd, a definite promise from some twenty-eight Cardinals and a conditional one from about four others.[4] Then they thought of the plan of only naming

---

[1] "Moron fu restituido a voz activa y passiva pero non se habla, ni hablara del a causa de lo sucedido," writes the Spanish ambassador, Vargas, on October 3, 1559, to Philip, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 27.

[2] *Avviso di Roma, September 16, 1559: "Monsignor, se voi l'avete studiat'hieri, io l'ho studiato 30 anni fa, che so quant'è huomo da ben il Morone e non è d'essere trattato com'è stato" (Urb. 1039, p. 83b, Vatican Library).

[3] *Avviso di Roma of September 23, 1559 (Urb. 1039, p. 86b, Vatican Library).

[4] Guise on September 27, in RIBIER, II., 833.

Tournon on twenty-four voting papers, after which the remainder of his friends, as if suddenly inspired, were to agree to the election, and thereby carry other Cardinals with them. The votes which were still wanting to make up the necessary thirty-one were to be supplied by those who had only promised their help in case of need. The only thing that brought this cleverly thought-out plan to grief was the fact that it had come to the ears of Carafa. In order to frustrate it he caused the rumour to be spread about that he and his whole party would also vote for Tournon. The consequence was that many of those who esteemed Tournon, but, nevertheless, did not wish to see him Pope, now drew back. Only fifteen voting papers contained his name, and it did not help matters when, in accordance with the previous arrangement, du Bellay, Armagnac, Crispi, Strozzi and an unknown voter subsequently declared themselves for him. No one dared to do anything further for Tournon, for fear of driving Carafa to declare himself for Pacheco, who in the same scrutiny had received eighteen votes and one *accessit*.[1] This very excited session had only proved that the French were as little able as the Spaniards to elect a Pope by their own power. Nothing could now be done but to make the election possible by an arrangement between the two parties; the former alliance between Este and Sforza now had to come into force.

After the vain attempt in favour of Tournon, the two leaders of the French party, Este and Guise, held a conference with du Bellay and Tournon, and it seemed to them as if Gonzaga were the man most likely to unite the votes of the French and Spaniards upon himself. The Cardinal of Mantua was outwardly supposed to be a member of the Spanish party, but he had also been designated as an acceptable candidate by the French king. After consulting together for several days the leaders of the French party went to Sforza on September 25th and begged him to propose a Cardinal from his party for election. Sforza in his turn named Gonzaga. To attempt, however, to effect his elevation in the usual manner, by secret ballot, appeared too uncertain, and it was therefore decided to summon the Cardinals immediately to the Pauline Chapel and to declare Gonzaga Pope by paying him general homage.[1]

---

[1] GUIDUS, 613; Conclavi, 159. The number of 15 votes and 5 *accessits* is certain from the *List of scrutinies (State Library, Munich; see Appendix No. 1), BONDONUS, 520; GUIDUS, 613; the account in the Conclavi is wrong at any rate in this point, which is not very clear in Guidus. Guardagno *writes on September 23, to the Duke of Mantua: "Hiera mattina si fecion prattiche per Tornone, i Francesi dicevon di havere 34 voti, ma dentro facevono conto che non havea più di 23 o 24, et in scrutinio di poi non hebbe più di 21, per il che pare che i Francesi si sieno levati in collera, ne voglion sentir più parlare di Papa, et dicon, che li Italiani non mantengon la fede, e si dubita che le cose non vadina in lungo" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

This attempt, undertaken with hardly any preparation, not only failed completely, but also led to a division of the Spanish party. Only nine Cardinals of that party joined the thirteen of the French assembled in the Pauline Chapel, the others declining to obey their leader Sforza. While Este, Guise, Sforza and Sermoneta were endeavouring to collect more votes, Madruzzo thought to attain their object in a simpler manner by crying out that Gonzaga was already Pope, and that he had the necessary number of votes. Only two Cardinals, however, allowed themselves to be moved by this to join Gonzaga; most of them remained inaccessible, barred in their cells till all was over. Farnese had in the meantime assembled his party in the Sistine Chapel; his brother Ranuccio, who was ill at the time, got out of bed and placed himself, wrapped in a fur mantle, at the door of the chapel, in order to let no one go over to their opponents. The exhortations of Farnese and Carafa to hold out obtained a brilliant success for their party.[2]

---

[1] RIBIER, II., 834.

[2] Guidus, 614 *seq.*, Bondonus, 520. Santa Fiora and Madruzzo to Philip II. on September 25, 1559, in PETRUCELLI, 136 *seq.* "*Se non era la furia di Trento, le cose succedevan felicissamente . . . Ferrara, Ghisa, Santa Fiore et Sermoneta eron intorno ad alcuni altri che vi mancavano a complir il numero che si ricerca, quando Trento troppo amorevole et frettoloso cominciò ò a gridare:

In reality the attempt to elevate Gonzaga showed the disunion of the Spanish party as well as the strong cohesion of that of Carafa. Even the Frenchman, Reumano, who owed his dignity of Cardinal to Paul IV., remained loyal to Carafa, and to the threats of his indignant countrymen answered that he would rather lose the whole of his property than break his pledged word.[1] Cardinal Vitelli made excuses to Gonzaga for having kept in the background at the elevation of a friend, by referring to the obligations which bound him to Carafa.[2]

Very probably this attempt on behalf of Gonzaga was not seriously meant by Este. According to his agreement with Sforza, both were to take steps either for Medici or for Gonzaga. Together with Sforza, Este decided in favour of Gonzaga because the latter would probably have more difficulty than Medici, and pressed for an immediate attempt for the Cardinal of Mantua, as the candidature of the more dangerous opponent would then be almost without any prospect of success.[3]

In spite of this first failure by Gonzaga, however, his adherents remained loyal to him. The party leaders, Este and Guise, Sforza and Madruzzo, mutually pledged themselves to vote for no one else till all hope of his success had disappeared. Even then they wished to keep together, and work in common for the election of the Pope.[4] Farnese and

---

Mantova, Mantova, Papa, Papa. Et non vi essendo il numero, Farnese et Caraffa hebbon tempo a non lasciare svolger quelli pochi che mancavano, et a proporre Pacheco in competentia come fece." Guadagno to the Duke of Mantua on September 27, 1559 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[1] GUIDUS, 615. [2] *Ibid.*, 614. [3] MÜLLER, 111 *seqq.*

[4] Este and Guise to the French King on September 27, 1559; Guise to Charles and Francis de Guise on September 27, 1559, in RIBIER, II., 833, 835. "*Ghisa, Ferrara, Trento et Santa Fiore, capi di questa lega, hanno promesso et giurato di non voler mai dar il voto loro ad altri, che hanno sottoscritto cedole di lor mano." Guadagno to the Duke of Mantua on September 27, 1559 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Also *Avviso di Roma, of September 30, 1559; the four leaders have given their pledge to Mantua, even if they should have to remain ten years in the conclave (Urb. 1039, p. 87b, Vatican Library).

Carafa, however, were just as firmly resolved on the other hand, to exclude Gonzaga from the Papacy at all costs.[1]

Both parties were almost equally strong,[2] and in view of the obstinacy with which they opposed one another, it seemed as if the election would be indefinitely prolonged. In the meantime Spanish diplomacy interfered in the most inconsiderate manner with the proceedings of the election, and the confusion was thus increased to the highest degree.

---

[1] Este and Guise wrote on October 18, 1559 (in Ribier, II., 835), that Carafa and Farnese sought to keep their adherents together by holding out to them hopes of the tiara, and by procuring for them at the voting 18, 20 or 22 votes to keep this hope alive. This, however, only relates to the days which immediately preceded October 18; on October 12 Ghislieri received 20 votes; on the 13, Ranuccio Farnese 21; on the 16, Gaddi 14; on the 17, Savelli 22. *Cf.* *Lists of the scrutinies (State Library, Munich, in Appendix No. 1).

[2] Gianfigliazzi writes at the end of September to the Duke of Florence that the Farnese-Carafa party had 25 Cardinals, and that of Gonzaga 22 (Petrucelli, 130). The so-called neutrals are here reckoned among the opponents of Gonzaga. According to Guadagna (*Letter of October 4, 1559, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua), du Bellay, Tournon, Armagnac, Lenoncourt, Guise, Este, Madruzzo, Sforza, Sermoneta, Morone, Medici, Puteo, Capodiferro, Cicada, Pisani, Cornaro, Cristoforo del Monte, Mercurio, Rovere, Corgna, Simoncelli, Strozzi and Gonzaga himself are all for the Cardinal of Mantua. Against him are, according to Guadagno: Alessandro and Ranuccio Farnese, Savelli, Carpi, Saraceni, Carlo Carafa, Scotti, Vitelli, Gaddi, Rebiba, Ghislieri, Diomede Carafa, Alfonso Carafa, Innocenzo del Monte, Reumano, Capizuchi and Dolera. At the name of Dolera there is the remark: "andrà a Mantova non mancando più di 2 voti." The neutrals are Pacheco, Ricci, and Crispi, Truchsess, Cesi, Dandino and Cueva. Guadagno says of Truchsess, Cesi and Dandino: "andranno in Mantova," and of Cueva: "andrà in Mantova mancando il suo voto." A list which the Imperial ambassador, Francis von Thurm, encloses in a letter to Ferdinand I. on September 30, 1559 (published by S. Brunner in the Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner-und Zisterzienserorden, VI., 2, 388 (1885), differs in the following respects from Guadagno's list: To the list of friends of Gonzaga it adds Saraceni, Cueva and Cesi, but omits Medici and Mercurio (Cueva was, according to Bondonus, 50, among the opponents of Gonzaga at the attempted homage on September 25; *cf.* Müller, 135). In the list of the opponents of Gonzaga, Saraceni and Innocenzo

The Spanish ambassador, Francisco de Vargas,[1] had arrived in Rome on September 25th, and he presented himself before the Cardinals on the following day.[2] In his person a diplomatist of no ordinary skill and obstinacy appeared upon the scene. It annoyed Vargas to hear in Italy that since Clement VII. no staunch adherent of Charles V. had ever gained the tiara, whereas, on several occasions, a Cardinal who had been excluded by the Emperor had succeeded in so doing.[3] Vargas

---

del Monte are missing. Thurm also reckons Medici, Innocenzo del Monte and Mercurio among the neutrals, but not Cesi and Cueva. A *third list in the Avvisi di Roma of October 7, 1559 (Urb. 1039, Vatican Library) counts 20 friends of Gonzaga; these are the Cardinals given as his friends by Guadagna with the exception of Morone, Medici and Mercurio. Among the opponents of Gonzaga this third list reckons all those quoted by Guadagno as opponents and neutrals, and in addition, Medici and Mercurio. Morone is not mentioned at all in this list. According to Vargas (letter of November 5, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 290) Sforza, Madruzzo, Morone, Cicada, Cornaro, Mercurio, Corgna, and Puteo, among the Spanish party voted for Gonzaga.

[1] Vargas, a zealous adherent of Ruy Gomez, had in spite of Alba's opposition, been appointed principally on the recommendation of Granvelle (HINAJOSA, 49; SUSTA, Pius IV., 129 *seq.*). Šusta gives in this connection an able picture of the diplomatist Vargas. CONSTANT, Rapport, 186 *seq.* gives the best account of his life, quoting much literature in connection with it.

[2] Vargas to Philip II., on September 27, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 267. Philip's letter to the Cardinals on September 9, 1559, which Vargas communicated to them on September 27, is printed in SÄGMÜLLER, 93 *seq.*, *cf.* HERRE, 44. Extract from Vargas' speech before the Cardinals and du Bellay's reply in GUIDUS, 615.

[3] Vargas to Philip II., on January 31, 1560, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 330.

made up his mind that this should not be the case under Philip II., and he therefore developed a feverish activity in order to influence the election in the Spanish interest.[1] He proceeded to do this with an incredible want of consideration. All the other ambassadors preserved at least the outward usages of decorum, but the zeal of Vargas knew no bounds. Scarcely a night passed that he did not enter the conclave by a window or a breach in the wall, in order to work on the Cardinals by promises and threats, often remaining there till daybreak.[2] He himself wrote to the king,[3] on November 5th, 1559, that he had taken more trouble about the conclave than in all his former missions together, and that if he did not succeed in gaining his end, he believed it would prove his death.

Vargas was not satisfied with the whole tendency and development of the proceedings so far. His opinion was that if the Cardinals who had Spanish sympathies would only unite among themselves they would not need the support of the adherents of the French party,[4] and that it was a matter of honour on their part to bring the election to an end in the Spanish sense without the help of a person so "hated by God and the Spanish king as Este."[5] The candidature of Gonzaga was also not approved of by Vargas, because it was a principle of Spanish policy that scions of Italian princely families should be kept from the tiara, so as not to endanger the peace of Italy,[6] and for the same reason he was at first opposed to Medici, as being a dependent of Cosimo I.[7]

---

[1] MÜLLER, 196, 198.

[2] Mocenigo in ALBÈRI, II., 4, 45. *Cf.*, ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 131.

[3] In DÖLLINGER, I., 289.

[4] Vargas on November 6, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 291.

[5] *Ibid.*, 292.

[6] Mocenigo (in ALBÈRI, II., 4, 32) writes that it was easier to be Pope if one did not belong to the nobility, but was of humble origin. The Duke of Alba gave it as his opinion with regard to Gonzaga that the rule that a man of noble birth was no use as a Pope was so general that there were hardly any exceptions to it. HINAJOSA, 64; HERRE, 43.

[7] ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 130.

At his first conference with Sforza, during the night of September 27th, Vargas put forward his views with great emphasis. In reply to his misgivings about Gonzaga, Sforza said that his candidature had no prospects of success, but that they must nevertheless appear to support him.[1] It was indeed a fact that neither Vargas nor Sforza dared openly to oppose a member of the powerful princely house of Mantua. Sforza appeared to be ready to enter into the alliance proposed by Vargas, and during the night of October 2nd, the three party leaders, Farnese, Carafa and Sforza held a meeting, at which they were reconciled and mutually promised to work in the interests of Philip's candidate.[2]

The Franco-Spanish alliance, the fruit of three weeks of endeavour and experience, seemed therefore to have been abandoned ; the business of the election had to be undertaken once more from the very beginning, and on quite new principles. The only drawback was that these principles were not clearly established ; the new party was wanting in unity. Each of the three leaders, Farnese, Sforza and Carafa, wished the election to be decided by himself alone, so that he might benefit to the fullest extent from the gratitude of the newly-elected Cardinal.[3] It was related of Carafa that half a day before the attempted elevation of Gonzaga, he had also conceived the plan, but quite independently of the French, of taking up the cause of Gonzaga, but had immediately changed his mind on learning that others had already taken the matter in hand, so that he himself would only play a secondary part in the elevation of that Cardinal.[4]

The new allies were not even of one mind with regard to the candidate they wished to support. In their first discussion during the night Vargas had dissuaded Sforza from assisting

---

[1] Vargas on September 28 and October 23, 1559, in Döllinger, I., 269, 272 ; Müller, 137.

[2] Vargas on October 3, in Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 271.

[3] Vargas on October 18 and November 5, *ibid.*, I., 280, 288.

[4] Guidus, 615.

Carpi and Pacheco, and had recommended Puteo and Medici.[1] At the meeting between the three leaders, however, Farnese and Carafa had definitely refused to support Puteo,[2] and remained, as they had been before, in favour, in the first instance, of Carpi and Pacheco.

The uncertainty of the position was very much increased by the fact that when Sforza entered into this new compact he did not immediately break off his former understanding with the French. He could not very well do this, for among the adherents who had remained faithful to him at the time of the rupture in the Spanish party were many personal friends of Gonzaga, whom he dared not offend,[3] and he was, moreover, afraid that if he deserted the French, Carafa would at once join them and bring the election to a conclusion without his help.[4] Sforza, therefore, worked with the French for Gonzaga and with his new allies for Carpi and Pacheco, but he was not sincere with either party, and, since his double dealing could not remain concealed he lost the confidence of his own party as well as of the French.[5] A coolness between Sforza and Vargas was also growing from day to day. Sforza, as well as Madruzzo, was justly indignant at the arrogant manner in which the ambassador sought to force his views on them.[6] The confusion was so great, as Madruzzo wrote to Philip II. on October 20th, that it could not have been worse.[7]

In order to find a way out of this state of confusion the divided Spanish party had, above all, to become clear as to their attitude towards Gonzaga. No information on this point was to be obtained from Vargas, for his instructions on this very matter were insufficient.[8] They had, therefore, to apply directly to the Spanish king. Towards the end of September a number of letters from Gonzaga's friends, as well as from his opponents in the Spanish party, were addressed to Spain, in order to obtain thence a decision as to this crucial question.[1] Farnese wrote to the king that if Gonzaga became Pope, Philip could see to it that the Spaniards were not driven out of Italy. Sforza, on the other hand, complained of Farnese to the king, saying that he opposed the Cardinal of Mantua for private reasons, although he well knew the loyalty of the latter to Spain ;[2] the alliance with the French could not be evaded, and he begged Philip to order the Spanish Cardinals to support Gonzaga. He bitterly complained of the insubordination of his party and of Pacheco in particular.[3] Pacheco, on the other hand, whom Philip had expressly designated as an acceptable candidate, made accusations against Sforza, and said that he had left him in the lurch.[4] Gonzaga himself sent an express messenger to Philip, but when he was in Florence he was induced by Duke Cosimo to return.[5] Cosimo also addressed himself to the Spanish king on September 29th ; he explained that a Franco-Spanish alliance was the only way of settling the election, and in order to maintain it he appeared to support Gonzaga, but in reality the only person for whom it would be possible to obtain the tiara was Medici.[6]

---

[1] Vargas on September 28, in DÖLLINGER, I., 269 *seq.*; MÜLLER, 140.

[2] Vargas on October 3, in DÖLLINGER, I., 271.

[3] MÜLLER, 146. [4] *Ibid*, 145. [5] *Ibid.*, 143, 147.

[6] *Cf.*, ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 131. [7] WAHRMUND, 82.

[8] MÜLLER, 129. "De cuantas cartas tenia Don Juan Figueroa para en sede vacante, no me he podido aprovechar de ninguna," writes Vargas on November 5, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 289.

Gonzaga's friends also sought to obtain letters of recommendation for him from other courts. The King of France answered in the most courteous terms, saying that if he were a Cardinal he would personally cross the Alps to be able to give his vote for Gonzaga.[7] King Ferdinand wrote, at the request of the Duke of Mantua and the Imperial ambassador, Francis von Thurm, to Cardinals Madruzzo, Truchsess and Morone that they should support the candidature of Gonzaga.[1]

---

[1] WAHRMUND, 82, 260 *seq.* MÜLLER, 130 *seqq.*

[2] WAHRMUND, 261.

[3] MÜLLER, 130 *seq.*

[4] *Ibid.*, 131.

[5] *Ibid.*, 135.

[6] *Ibid.*, 132.

[7] WAHRMUND, 261.

Considering the means of communication of that time, an answer from Spain could not be expected to arrive in Rome in less than four weeks so that, as September had passed without any result as far as the election was concerned, the like was to be expected in October. The parties, as Curzio Gonzaga wrote to Mantua on October 4th, were standing firmly opposed to one another; the business of the election could only proceed when an answer had been received from the Catholic King.[2]

The great consideration extended to the princes gave much scandal in Rome, and indeed throughout the whole of Italy. The Conservators of the city appeared before the Cardinals on October 4th and reproached them for seeking instructions from abroad, thereby quite misunderstanding their own dignity and position.[3] They begged them to hasten the election as much as possible, since public security in Rome was so greatly endangered by the long duration of the conclave that honest people were no longer sure of their lives. Then the Conservators endeavoured to justify the people for an occurrence which had taken place during the preceding night. The day before, some persons belonging to the French embassy had shot a gentleman-at-arms of the prefect of one of the districts in the open street because the said prefect had deprived one of their number of a prohibited weapon without regard for the French privileges. In revenge for this the people had, during the following night almost stormed and burned down the dwelling of the French ambassador.[4] The Conservators concluded by declaring that if a Pope were not speedily given to the city they would make use of the authority to which they were entitled, and prevent the Cardinals from communicating with the outside world by letter.

---

[1] Letter of October 14, 1559, in S. BRUNNER in the Studien und Mitteilungen aus dem Benediktiner-und Zisterzienserorden, VI., 2, 389 (1885); WAHRMUND, 260. *Cf.* Giacomo Soranzo on October 20, 1559, in TURBA, III., 107.

[2] *Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.

[3] GUIDUS, 617.

[4] *Ibid.*, 616.

The Cardinal-Dean, du Bellay, dismissed the Conservators with a sharp reproof on account of their arrogant language and the excesses of the previous night. The complaints were, however, only too well justified, and other remonstrances were not wanting regarding the general insecurity in Rome.[1] The want of order in the conclave itself was so great that the Venetian ambassador, Mocenigo, wrote in 1560 that it was the most open and free of which there was any record.[2] On October 2nd four Cardinals were appointed,[3] who were to confer with the ordinary commission of Cardinals concerning a reform of the conclave. They did indeed make various regulations,[4] but, as Bondonus says, although these were well conceived nobody paid any attention to them.[5] The windows and breaches in the walls by which Cardinals and conclavists communicated with the outside world were indeed closed, but were very soon opened again,[6] and no lasting improvement of the conditions took place.

As a matter of fact, no exhortations or regulations for reform could have much success as long as the evil was not grasped at the root, and the secular princes deprived of all influence in the Papal election. Nobody, however, had the courage to take a step of such decisive importance, for the favour of so powerful a monarch as Philip II. must be retained for the Church. Nothing else was therefore possible but to suffer as before the intercourse with the ambassadors, and to await with patience the decision of the Spanish king as to the candidature of Gonzaga which had been asked for.

---

[1] The *Avviso di Roma of September 23, 1559, announces that many murders take place by day and by night (Urb. 1039, p. 85. Vatican Library). Cardinal Cueva spoke to the same effect in an address to the conclave on November 12 (Guidus, 619): "Lites non legibus, sed gladiis et caedibus diffiniebantur' complained the Conservators on November 3. Guidus, 618. *Cf.* Susta, Pius IV., 135.

[2] Mocenigo, 43. *Cf.* Dembiński, Wybór Piusa IV., 260; Šusta, Pius IV., 134 See *ibid.* concerning the abuses in the matter of wagers as to who should be Pope; many conclavists made these for their own personal gain.

[3] They were Madruzzo, Este, Scotti and Carafa. Bondonus, 521.

[4] Bondonus, 522; Guidus 617.

[5] Bondonus, 522.

[6] Mocenigo, *loc. cit.*

Philip II. was in no hurry with his reply. It appeared to him impossible to declare himself in favour of Gonzaga, yet to pronounce against him, the member of so highly esteemed a princely family, was both distasteful and dangerous.[1] He therefore postponed his answer from week to week, hoping perhaps that the Cardinals would understand his silence, and at length decide as he wished without express instructions from him. This, in fact, was what actually took place.

The conclave remained for a few weeks completely undecided as to the election. As a matter of form, the daily voting took place, and Pacheco regularly received from seventeen to twenty-two votes, and Cueva from twelve to eighteen.[2] Cardinals of whose actual elevation no one was really thinking, often received an unusual number of votes, merely as a compliment, as, for instance, Saraceni, who on October 5th and 7th had sixteen and nineteen votes, Rebiba on the 6th no less than seventeen, and Ghislieri at a later date twenty. To Cardinal Ranuccio Farnese, whose name is otherwise only occasionally mentioned, twenty-one votes were given on October 13th, merely because it was the anniversary of his grandfather's election. Similar surprises occurred every day.[3]

In the midst of the tedious monotony of the almost suspended proceedings, a little excitement was caused by a striking remark made by Cardinal Medici, who, in conversation with Cardinal Truchsess said: "As regards the Germans, we should have to summon a Council, to see if some concessions could not be made to them with regard to the marriage of priests and Communion under both kinds." Such words in the mouth of a Cardinal in whom many saw the future Pope, caused Truchsess such great scandal that he considered it his duty to bring it to the notice of the electors, and as it gave rise to considerable comment, he drew up a written report of his conversation with Medici on October 13th and another in November.[1] The whole affair, however, injured the Cardinal of Augsburg rather than the reputation of Medici.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* Tiepolo to the Signoria of Venice, Toledo, December 11, 1559, in BROWN, VII., n. 117.

[2] *Cf.* the *List of scrutinies (State Library, Munich) in Appendix No. 1.

[3] *Cf. ibid.*

The weary waiting for a reply from Philip at length seemed to the Cardinals a burden too great to be borne. The patience of the hot-blooded Carafa was the first to give way; he feared that his adherents might not, in the end, withstand the temptations of the opposite party during this long delay.[3] On October 11th, he declared to Cardinal Sforza that if he did not break off his alliance with the Spaniards within four days, he would himself separate from him, and, in conjunction with the French, raise Cardinal Tournon to the Papal throne; he could easily bring about this result with the seventeen votes of which he had command and those of the French. Sforza begged for a delay until October 17th, and this Carafa allowed him.[4]

In the face of this threat, Vargas thought that he ought to delay no longer in taking a definite step against Gonzaga, and he therefore wrote to Madruzzo, the special friend of the latter, saying that it would be as well to refrain from supporting Gonzaga any longer, as, under the present circumstances there was no hope of his candidature being successful.[5]

---

[1] Too much curtailed in SICKEL, Konzil, 17 *seqq*, 20, *cf.* 84 *seq.*; complete in Urb. 847, Vatican Library. *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 133 n. 1.

[2] *Cf.* MÜLLER, 151 *seqq.* Several days before the election Truchsess was reconciled to Medici; *ibid.* 224 *seq.*

[3] Vargas on November 5, 1559 in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 284.

[4] GUIDUS, 617 *seq.* Vargas on October 13, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 274.

[5] WAHRMUND, 261. Vargas on October 13 and 18, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 275, 276; MÜLLER, 149.

Madruzzo, however, would not give up the support of Gonzaga. He answered the ambassador by saying that he could not understand how he could express himself in such terms about so good a friend of Spain; at the same time he wrote to Philip II. that the Cardinal of Mantua deserved the Papacy a hundred times, and that he could be of more use to the world as Pope than all the others together.[1]

The rest of the Spanish supporters of Gonzaga had pledged themselves, with Sforza, to wait until October 17th for the courier from Spain, and on that day they extended the period by yet another eight or ten days. Sforza only gave way to the importunity of Carafa to the extent that he did not renew the promise of his friends, as far as he himself was concerned.[2]

This slight concession naturally did not satisfy Carafa. He now approached the French who, at his overtures, at once despatched a courier to the French king; the hostility of Carafa towards Sforza in the meantime increased from "hour to hour." He complained to Vargas that Sforza was his enemy, and wished to destroy him and his house; the King of Spain would sacrifice the Carafa without scruple to please a Pope elected according to the proposals of Sforza. He would therefore support Farnese, as he had promised, and repudiate Gonzaga, and for the rest, in spite of his earnest desire to serve Philip, he would adopt a neutral attitude between the parties. The ambassador sought to dissuade him, but in vain; Carafa adhered to his resolution.[3] Este was jubilant at this success; he now threw off his mask, canvassed for votes for himself, made extensive offers and promises, as was his wont, and gained ground hour to hour.[4]

Such was the position of affairs when at last, on October 27th, a letter from King Philip arrived. It bore the dates of October 8th and 9th, and contained nothing concerning Gonzaga's candidature, but, instead, news which could not have arrived more inopportunely for Vargas. With regard to the dispute concerning the possession of Paliano,[1] which was still going on, Philip chose just this moment to come to the decision that Paliano should be restored to its former owner, Marcantonio Colonna; not a syllable as to any indemnification for the Carafa was to be found in the letter.[2] Vargas naturally endeavoured to keep this unlucky news secret, but the courier was aware of the orders which he had brought and informed everybody of the interesting news. Carafa was almost in despair.[3] He complained aloud that the king thought nothing of him, that he was insulting him at the very moment he was rendering him a great service. Vargas was likewise in great perplexity. He took the greatest pains in personal conversation, and also through the intervention of friends, either to deny the contents of the dispatch entirely, or to represent the order as being founded on suppositions which were now obsolete. As Carafa, who had to assist so many of his adherents, was in pecuniary difficulties, Vargas, "as a kind friend" felt moved to offer him from 2000 to 3000 scudi, while the Viceroy of Naples, at the instigation of Vargas, sent an order for 4000 scudi, which he, again purely out of "friendship" wished to lend the Cardinal. Carafa accepted these gifts, and, naturally, could not immediately separate himself from Spain.[4]

---

[1] Letter of October 20, 1559, in WAHRMUND, 82 *seq.*

[2] Vargas on October 18, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 279 *seq.*

[3] Vargas on November 5, 1559 *ibid.*, 282 *seqq.*

[4] Vargas, *ibid.*, 285.

Cardinal Sforza criticised Vargas' procedure at this time very sharply in a letter to the secretary of the Spanish ambassador, Ascanio Caracciolo. He would appeal to the king, as judge between himself and Vargas, writes the leader of the Spanish party. It was really too disgraceful that they should have to try to gain their ends by offers of money. They could have been just as successful without bribes, and without acting in any way contrary to the king's wishes, as by making use of such means. Carafa was not by any means an important person; it would have been of far greater importance to keep on good terms with the influential Gonzaga than to gain over Carafa, without any advantage to themselves, and by such disgraceful measures.[1] Moreover, according to Duke Cosimo's opinion, Este, not Carafa, was the person about whom they ought to trouble themselves. Should they succeed in inducing the former to give up his hopes of the tiara, then affairs would come right of themselves; on the other hand, if they could not succeed in doing this, then they were only pouring water into a sieve.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 212.

[2] Vargas on November 3, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 285 *seq.*

[3] *Cf.* DEMBIŃSKI, Wybór, 239.

[4] *Ibid.*, 286-7.

In reality, however, whether he wished it or not, Carafa was obliged to keep in with Spain, because it was only from Philip that he could expect an Italian principality, and not from the French, who had no power in Italy; it was also very doubtful if Carafa's whole party would join him in throwing themselves into the hands of the French.[3]

The decision of Philip II. regarding the possession of Paliano had shown that he was of the same opinion as Sforza and the Duke of Florence with regard to the importance of Carafa, and Vargas' report from Rome did not succeed in making him change his mind. To the oft-repeated request of the ambassador that Philip would authorize him to make promises to Carafa, he answered nothing further on October 26th[4] than to say that the former pension of 12,000 scudi[5] granted to Carafa should be continued.

Several days before, on October 20th, Philip had finally given his decision with regard to the candidature of Gonzaga for the Papacy.[6] It was to the effect that the election of the Cardinal of Mantua was at all costs to be prevented. The ambassador, however, was to let no one know this, though, in case of extreme need, he might inform Sforza. In other respects, however, Vargas was to show himself very attentive to Gonzaga, and to assure him of Philip's great esteem.[1] The king, moreover, was not wanting himself in fair words. He regretted to learn, he wrote to the Duke of Mantua, that his ambassador should have shown such opposition to Cardinal Gonzaga; he could not, indeed, order anyone to vote for him, but should he be elected it would give him great pleasure.[2]

---

[1] Letter of November 7, 1559, in PETRUCELLI, 147.

[2] Cosimo I. to Concini on November 4, 1559, in PETRUCELLI, 145 *seq.* *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 143.

[3] MÜLLER, 161.

[4] *Ibid.*, 168.

[5] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 213.

[6] MÜLLER, 136. According to Vargas, Philip's dispatch was on October 23 (DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 296); the 23rd was the day of the departure of the courier (MÜLLER, 206).

While Philip was proceeding with the greatest caution with regard to the influential Gonzaga, his ambassador was acting less guardedly in Rome. In a second letter, of October 27th, the king had again referred to Gonzaga's exclusion, but this time without renewing the order to work secretly towards this end. It happened, by accident, that this second letter was the first to reach Rome, the first, that of October 20th, only arriving on November 19th, while the second was received as early as the 11th.[3] Vargas was extremely glad at the arrival of this message, the coming of which had been already announced from Mantua and Florence. The news caused the greatest excitement in the conclave. During the night of November 12th, Vargas arranged with Sforza that Gonzaga must be informed of Philip's decision, so that he might give up all further attempts to obtain the tiara.[4] This, however, was by no means in accordance with Philip's wishes, and he afterwards sharply reprimanded Vargas for having, by his want of prudence and lack of diplomacy, left him to contend with the whole of Italy, while there was no end to the complaints which Gonzaga himself and his relatives, the Dukes of Mantua and Urbino, had addressed to him concerning his ambassador.[5]

Gonzaga, wearied by the long waiting for Philip's answer, had himself withdrawn his candidature a few days previously, on November 8th, though without the secret endeavours on his behalf having in the meantime come to an end, although now the hopes of his friends naturally sank very considerably. Gonzaga received Sforza's communication with calmness and dignity; the manner, too, in which he had a short time before, made his renunciation of his candidature before the Cardinals, was calculated to raise him in everybody's esteem.[1]

---

[1] MÜLLER, 136.

[2] *Ibid.*, 175.

[3] Vargas on November 30, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 294.

[4] Vargas on November 30, 1559, *ibid.*, 294 *seq.*

[5] Philip to Vargas on January 8, 1560, in MÜLLER, 206.

Vargas' plans seemed to have been crowned with success by the retirement of Gonzaga. Sforza had broken with the French, and the unity of the Spanish party had been outwardly restored. The Spaniards could now set to work with reunited forces to secure victory for a candidate of their own. On November 14th they agreed to make an attempt next with Carpi's candidature, and proceeded to do so at once. The French, however, proved to be so exceedingly opposed to this plan, that Carafa, with Madruzzo, Farnese and Sforza, told them, on November 19th, that any further attempts would prove fruitless. Carpi received this announcement "like a saint;" they must not delay the conclave on his account, he said, he did not wish to stand in the way of the most worthy man.[2]

In Vargas' opinion, the Spaniards should now have concentrated on Pacheco. They were, however, unable to do so, for, in the meantime, the unity of the Spanish leaders, which had only been maintained with considerable difficulty, was again broken by the withdrawal of Carpi.

During the night of November 12th, when Sforza was informed of the exclusion of Gonzaga, a discussion had also taken place between the Spanish ambassador and Carafa, during which Vargas showed the Cardinal a letter in which Philip spoke of the latter with great appreciation, and assured him of the continuance of the pension of 12,000 scudi which had been previously granted him. Carafa had answered that he wished for something more; on account of the honour of his house, he expected from the king the title of prince for his brother. Vargas could only reassure him by enlarging on the magnanimity and generosity of his master, "a half word from whom was of greater value than all the promises and assurances of other princes."[1] Soon afterwards, in order to offer an equivalent to the offers of the French,[2] he made Carafa general assurances and promises,[3] and finally, after repeated deliberations with the most important members of the Spanish party, he had recourse to the grave measure of exceeding his authority and giving Carafa a written promise of the desired reward. At the same time, however, he impressed upon him that it would prove far more advantageous for him to leave everything to the royal generosity of Philip.[4]

---

[1] Vargas on November 30, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 294; GUIDUS, 619.

[2] Vargas, *loc. cit.* 295; GUIDUS, 620. On November 11, Carpi had 5 votes, on the 17 and 18 he had 12, but they soon sank again. See *List of scrutinies (State Library, Munich) in Appendix No. 1.

All these efforts, however, were in vain. The French were actively soliciting the friendship of Carafa at the same time as Vargas, and their leader, Este, was, as described by Philip's ambassador, the most formidable opponent in negotiations of that kind, that had ever been seen.[5] The French, moreover, did not need to limit themselves to vague promises with little security behind them. Catherine de' Medici had, at their request, addressed a flattering letter to Carafa in which she expressly assured him that all promises made to him and his house would be certain to obtain the approval of the French court.[6] Catherine's letter arrived about the same time as that of the Spanish king. Carafa, therefore, declared to the French that he was for the moment bound by his promise for Carpi; on the very day, however, that Carpi withdrew from his candidature he would retire from his adherence to the

---

[1] Vargas in DÖLLINGER, I., 297.

[2] They are said to have already offered him the Marquisate of Saluzzo (on the French-Italian frontier) and 30,000 ducats in silver, as well as the promise of all his benefices in Italy. Gianfigliazzi, in PETRUCELLI, 121; *cf.* 130. MÜLLER, 147.

[3] Vargas, *loc. cit.*

[4] *Ibid.*, 299 *seq.*

[5] "el mas terrible hombre que se ha visto;" *ibid.*, 297.

[6] MÜLLER, 169 *seq.*

Spanish party. On the night of November 26th he made a detailed declaration to this effect before Pacheco, Madruzzo, Farnese and Sforza, and repeated it even more fully on the following night in the presence of Vargas. Now as before, he assured them, his own wishes led him to serve the Spanish king; he would, however, pledge himself to nothing, and would not be bound by any exclusion on the part of the powers, but would give his vote to the candidate who, in his opinion, was the best for Spain.[1] Carafa, therefore, did not dare to break completely with his former friends; indeed he complained that Sforza no longer invited him to the meetings of the Spanish party.[2] He wished to make the Spaniards realize the value of his friendship by his separation from them. Should the king really prove unwilling to grant Carafa's wishes after this experience, then he intended to go over entirely to the side of the French, and with their assistance to elevate a Cardinal from whom he might hope for something for his house.[3] He had Carpi, Reumano and Dolera in view.[4] It also pleased him to be regarded by both Spaniards and French as the arbiter of the conclave and to be paid court to by them; at this time he was filled with such arrogance that people hardly ventured to address him.[5]

It was true that Carafa now had the election in his hand; to whichever side he, with the sixteen votes of his party of firm adherents should incline, there it seemed that the decisive power must lie.

The altered state of affairs found expression in the fact that the candidates of the French party now seemed to come into prominence in the conclave, while previously there had only been question of the endeavours of the Spaniards on behalf of the Cardinals who were agreeable to them. Gonzaga's adherents took fresh courage, while Este, in particular, thought that his own time had come. On the evening of November 30th he wished homage to be paid to him as Pope. Great excitement thereupon arose in the conclave; only Sforza remained calm and made reply to the agitated Carpi that there was a great deal of noise, but that the danger was, nevertheless, very slight, and that Vargas would be able to write to Philip II. that he had averted a great danger.[1] According to Vargas' report, Sforza and the others were half dead from fear; nobody had attempted any resistance until, in answer to his entreaties and appeals, Este's opponents had again pulled themselves together.[2] Vargas remained standing half the night at a breach in the wall of the conclave; they were pursuing a false course, he called out to the Cardinals, if they flattered themselves by remembering that Charles V. had shown the greatest favour to the very men who had formerly been his opponents, but that now they were living in a new world. Should Este become Pope, then war, vexation and schism would be inevitable, as he was openly purchasing the tiara in the most shameful manner.[1]

---

[1] Vargas, *loc. cit.*, 300 *seq.*

[2] *Ibid.*, 307.

[3] MÜLLER, 172 *seq.*

[4] Vargas, *loc. cit.*, 301.

[5] *Ibid.* *Cf.* also the *letter of Tonina of January 15, 1561, quoted in Chapter IV., p. 132, n. 2 *infra* (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

---

[1] Petrucelli 152. *Hier dopo magnare il Ferrara radoppiò tanto le sue prattiche che si erano sentite li giorni innanzi che fece paura a tutto 'l mondo di havere di riuscire hier notte papa, et non solamente a quelli di fuora, ma a quelli di drento, et fu di tal sorta la paura, che molti della contraria parte stavano tanto sbigottiti, che erano per andarvi, vedendo il Carafa andarci: pensando che tutti li suoi anche vi andassero, et vedendo anche che una buona parte della fattione del Camerlengo ci andava, ancora che lui stesso non ci andasse, però havevano paura, che venendo la cosa alla stretta, che ci andasse. Li ministri cattolici furono al conclave et vi stettero fino a 6 hore, Trento si portò valorosamente acciò si scostasse parte de' Carafeschi che furono da cinque o sei et così la cosa si quietò, ancora che havesse 27 voti. Non perse però speranza perchè questa mattina in scrutinio ha fatto un altro rumore, et se dubitava che questa notte non volesse fare più sforzo che hier notte. Però ci sono avvisi del conclave di 3 hore di notte di questa sera, che dicono che non solo si è fatto poco, ma niente, et secondo il tenore di questo avviso pare che Ferrara voglia renovare le prattiche di Mantova et la oppinione di molti è che lo faccia pensando che Farnese per liberarsi della paura del Mantova andasse in lui. Dandino is ill, and S. Giorgio is likely to die, di modo che la fattione di Ferrara si sminuisse et bisognerà si risolva.—Juan Antonio de Tassis a Mad. Margherita d'Austria reggente di Fiandra (State Archives, Naples, C. Farnes, 763).

[2] Vargas in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 305.

It is probable, however, that Carafa had only supported Este in this attempt in the hope that thereby Sforza would be forced to the election of Este's rival, Carpi. As several who had at first promised Este their votes did not now keep their word, Carafa also drew back, so that the Cardinal of Ferrara had far less than the required number of votes. His friends, however, did not relax their efforts on his behalf,[2] and Este spoke to Duke Cosimo of Florence as late as December 3rd in very optimistic terms about his election.[3] He only really abandoned hope in the concluding days of the conclave.

The principal reason why Este could no longer put off his open canvassing for the tiara was that his two most zealous adherents, Cardinals Capodiferro and Dandino, were sick unto death and were given up by the physicians.[4] Many other Cardinals were also seriously threatened in their health by the long confinement in the bad air of a closed apartment, over crowded with people.[5] The consequences of the long vacancy were also every day making themselves more unpleasantly felt outside the conclave. The scarcity in the city was constantly increasing,[1] while disputes were now settled by the sword instead of by proper legal means.[2] General indignation prevailed at the delay in the election.[3] On November 12th the treasurers informed the Cardinals that they could raise no more money to pay the troops.[4] The number of soldiers was then reduced, but the officials of the Apostolic Camera soon complained that the money was not sufficient even for the reduced number.[5] It caused a great sensation when several Protestants from Carinthia and Switzerland took advantage of the prevailing lawlessness to steal into the city in monks' habits and to disseminate their doctrines in sermons and disputations.[6] The Romans felt that their honour was attacked by this occurrence, when it was reported that the foreign preachers had explained that the destruction of the buildings of the Inquisition, at the death of Paul IV., was a sign that there existed leanings towards the false doctrines among the Roman people. They loudly called for the intruders to be handed over to the people for judgment, so that they might vindicate their orthodoxy.[7]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 306.

[2] The highest number of votes gained by Este was at the beginning of December (on the 1 and 4) but they never exceeded 12 or 13. See *List of scrutinies (State Library, Munich) in Appendix No. 1.

[3] PETRUCELLI, 151.

[4] GUIDUS, 623.

[5] "Deinde (November 30) fuerunt intromissi 12 fachini, qui . . . deberent purgare conclave, in quo fetor erat insupportabilis, et multi cupiebant exire timentes aliquam contagiosam infirmitatem" (BONDONUS, 526). The *Avvisi of December 2 (Urb. 1039, p. 105b, Vatican Library) notes that many were ill in the conclave. "Gran puzzone è in conclavi": December 11, *ibid.* p. 106b. "Dentro hay muchos enfermos": Vargas on November 29, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 303. *Cf.* MÜLLER, 201; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 144.

There was no lack of exhortations to the Cardinals to come to a decision at last. Cardinal Cueva, for example, made an earnest speech on November 12th, immediately after the voting, in which he laid stress on the disastrous consequences of the dragging on of the conclave.[8] The Conservators of the city again made their appearance and renewed their former complaints on November 27th.[1] On this occasion they were listened to to such an extent that some eighty,[2] or according to another report, as many as a hundred and twenty[3] conclavists were expelled from the enclosure. On November 30th Fabio Cordella, a Doctor of Law, was appointed Master of the Conclave ; he had to see that the order for reform with regard to the meals of the Cardinals did not remain a dead letter.[4] To the Governor of the Borgo was assigned the duty of seeing that all the rooms adjoining or underneath the conclave were kept closed, so that communication with outside might be lessened.[5]

---

[1] Guidus, 621 (on November 27).

[2] Guidus, 618. *Cf. supra* p. 31, n. 1.

[3] *Cf.* Dembiński, Wybór, 260.

[4] Guidus, 619.

[5] Bondonus, 528. According to the *accounts in the State Archives, Rome, the total expenses for the conclave amounted to 60,000 ducats; the mercenaries cost 40,118 ducats. See Šusta, Pius IV., 144, n. 2.

[6] Guidus, 618.

[7] *Ibid.*, 618; *cf.* 619, 624.

[8] Guidus, 619. Pacheco blamed, so it was stated in Rome (*Avviso di Roma of Novemver 18, 1559, Urb. 1039, p. 102,

Representatives of foreign princes frequently appeared before the conclave to urge speed in the election. The ambassador of the King of France thus appeared on November 14th,[6] and on the 25th the Imperial ambassador, Francis von Thurm.[7] Vargas had already, on September 27th and again on October 13th, addressed the Cardinals in carefully prepared speeches, while on December 8th he reappeared before them with a letter from his king,[8] and admonished them anew as to the

---

Vatican Library) Carafa very much on account of his "strani trattati"; he said to him, which pleased most people very much : "che tal cose non eran'a far in conclavi, ne tra cardinali, et che molto si maravegliava della sua presontion et audatia con tanto poco respetto al grado ch'hora teniva et al sacro collegio."

[1] GUIDUS, 621.

[2] BONDONUS, 526.

[3] GUIDUS, 622. According to the *Avviso di Roma of December 2, 1559, 60 conclavists were expelled on Wednesday, November 29, and many others on the 30 (Urb. 1039, p. 105, Vatican Library).

[4] BONDONUS, 526. Bondonus remarks on December 5 : "observatum, quod pro Ill^{mis} non intromitteretur nisi unum ferculum."

[5] *Ibid.*, 526, 529 (on December 1 and 20).

[6] *Ibid.*, 525.

[7] *Ibid.*, 526 ; WAHRMUND, 262 ; ŠUSTA Pius IV., 140.

[8] Of November 16, which reached Rome on December 4. It is printed in WAHRMUND, 84 *seqq.* *Cf.* MÜLLER, 182 SÄGMÜLLER, 100.

necessity of concluding the election at the earliest possible moment. The Cardinal Dean, du Bellay, answered him, and took the opportunity of including several unpleasant truths in his remarks. He drew attention to the fact that the cause of the delay was to be attributed, for the most part, to the unjustifiable influence which was being exercised from outside; as soon, he continued, as the Cardinals were allowed full liberty, the election would quickly be settled, but that it was quite useless to exhort the Cardinals in public to the greatest possible haste, and then in secret to do everything possible to drag on the election to an interminable length.[1]

Du Bellay had given utterance to these hints in a rather irritated manner,[2] and Vargas, therefore, naturally endeavoured, with the support of Pacheco and Farnese, to defend his sovereign from all shadow of blame.[3] To this defence du Bellay answered that the Cardinals who were unwilling to obey orders were threatened on the part of the Spanish court with the loss of their revenues, whereupon Pacheco twice called out in a loud voice that this was not true.[4] Then followed the delivery of the royal message, which was drawn up in dignified terms.[5] The king, it was stated, did not wish to interfere in the election in any way likely to hinder it; it was not his business to lay down rules to the Cardinals for the election; they must only keep in view the service of God, and choose, without any consideration for him, the candidate most likely to be useful in the present parlous condition of the Church. Du Bellay answered Vargas' defence in courteous terms, but did not fail to express the hope that deeds might correspond to words.

---

[1] "Si quid nunc ab ipsis peccaretur, tolerabilius videri debeat, quod non magis ipsorum culpa acciderit, quam eorum, qui sese in electionis negotio, quod ad eos nulla ex parte pertineret, immiscere tam sollicite vellent. Nihil enim intra parietes conclavis dissidii esse, quod non extrinsecus importaretur." GUIDUS, 624.

[2] "non sine stomacho prolata." GUIDUS, 624.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] MÜLLER, 182 *seq.* *Cf.* in order to appreciate the accusation, *ibid.*, 199, and MERKLE, II., 624, n. 5.

[5] WAHRMUND, 84.

Farnese, on the other hand, declared that Philip's conduct required no justification, and that du Bellay had not, in the closing words of his speech, spoken in the sense of the whole Sacred College.[1]

On the same day, December 8th, on which Vargas delivered this message, the French made an attempt to elevate Reumano to the Papal throne.[2] A little time before they had been working for Tournon, while Cesi and Pisani had also been spoken of about the same time.[3] None of these, however, had any prospect of success. The candidature of a native of France, as both Reumano and Tournon were, was exceedingly unpopular with the people of Rome. The days of Avignon had not yet been forgotten, and it was feared that a Frenchman might remove the seat of the Papacy from Rome. When a rumour got abroad on the night of December 8th, that Reumano had nearly been elected, the people rushed to the Capitol and threatened to ring the tocsin, and quiet was not restored till news arrived that Reumano would not be elected.[4] The French candidates also met with enemies within their own party. Este had not yet given up his own hopes and was secretly working against his own party.[5] Carafa, too, was now only apparently on the side of the French, but in reality he had again been approached by the Spaniards, and had gone over to them.

Vargas, to whom the friendship of Carafa meant everything, was now awaiting, with the greatest anxiety, the royal confirmation of the extensive promises which he had taken upon himself upon his own responsibility, to make to Carafa. When no such authority had arrived by the beginning of December, and a complete breaking away on the part of Carafa seemed imminent, he thought that he might venture to do independently what he believed had only been omitted in Spain through a failure to understand the real state of affairs. He therefore drew up a document making extensive concessions to Carafa, and communicated the contents to the ambitious Cardinal, as having been really written by Phillip.[1] Carafa was at once won over to Philip's side, although he declared that he could not immediately pass over to the Spanish party, but must wait for a fitting opportunity.

---

[1] GUIDUS, 625.

[2] GUIDUS, 625 *seq.* According to the *Avviso di Roma of December 11, 1559 (Urb. 1039, p. 106, Vatican Library), work was being carried on for Reumano even during the night of the 10, and on the 11, but they did not succeed in getting together 27 votes. Vargas on December 12, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 310.

[3] PETRUCELLI, 154 *seq.* Tournon said: "non volere che per lui s'allonghi il conclave per un giorno." *Avviso di Roma of December 11, 1559 (Urb. 1030, p. 106, Vatican Library).

[4] GUIDUS, 626; PETRUCELLI, 154.

[5] MÜLLER, 190.

Carafa was, however, soon forced to throw off the mask by the force of circumstances. The French had been planning the election of Gonzaga since the beginning of December. Carafa had promised Cardinals Guise, Este and Madruzzo, even before the attempted elevation of Reumano, to support Gonzaga with seven votes,[2] and thereby assure his election; he requested, however, a further delay in order, in the meantime, to honour and please several of his adherents by making apparent attempts to secure their election.[3] Finally, on December 14th, he definitely agreed to give his support to the Cardinal of Mantua. On the 13th it was generally expected in the city that, in a very short time, a decision in favour of Gonzaga would be made; Madruzzo and others had already had their silver removed from the conclave so that it might not disappear in the usual plundering after the election.[4]

---

[1] Vargas on December 12, 1559 in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge I., 309: "Accordé sin dar parte a persona formar un capitulo, come que V.M. me lo escribia."

[2] "con sette voti:" *Curzio Gonzaga to the Castellan of Mantua on December 15, 1559 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); "con seis de sus votos:" Vargas on December 14, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 314.

[3] *Curzio Gonzaga, *loc. cit.* According to Curzio the attempt for Reumano was only a pretence.

[4] Vargas, *loc. cit.*

The old opponents of Gonzaga, Farnese, Sforza and the adherents of Carafa had not been idle. On the morning of the decisive day, Carafa asked for a further delay from Este and Guise until the afternoon; soon afterwards the whole conclave resounded with the cries of "Carpi! Carpi!" and the latter was proclaimed Pope by many Cardinals instead of Gonzaga. The French, however, were not unprepared. Carafa had let it be understood that he was only planning an apparent attempt on behalf of Carpi, but the French were not deceived; they had, in any case, a more than sufficient number of votes ready for the exclusion of Carpi. They assembled in a compact body in the Sistine Chapel and mocked at Carafa's vain efforts.[1] On the following night there arose a heated altercation between Carafa and Guise,[1] and Carafa entered into a formal alliance with Sforza, backed up by his signature, by which the two party leaders promised to work in union with each other, and Carafa agreed that he would no longer promote the election of the Cardinals excluded by

---

[1] The reports in BONDONUS, 528, GUIDUS, 626 *seq.*, of Vargas, *loc. cit.*, and Curzio Gonzaga do not agree in all points. The account we have given agrees in all essentials with the hitherto unpublished *letter of Curzio Gonzaga (see *supra* p. 47, n. 3): . . . già più di otto giorni sono Carafa havea dato la fede sua con quelle maggior parole che dir si possono in simili negotii, al cardinale di Guisa, a quello di Ferrara et a quello di Trento di venir in Mantua con setti voti et di facto papa, perchè tanti erano anche di soverchio. Ora per questo si tenea la cosa franca, ne si aspettava altro che il giorno determinato, perchè Carafa havea tolto tempo di voler dare qualche sodisfattione ai cardinali dalla sua fattione, et così se fece quella sborita di Reumani, come dee sapere; finalmente parendo a questi rev^{mi} Francesi, che quest' uomo la tirasse più in lungo di quello che bisognava, commincioron a dubitare et a restringer il negotio et a pregarlo a volerle ormai dar fine, tal che esso non sapendo più come tirarla in lungo, disse che il di seguente, che fu ieri, cioè il XIV di questo, senza fallo l' espediria et che l' allongava questo poto di più per dar un poco di sodisfatione a Carpi et per vedere di vincere un altro voto delli suoi, il che intendendo quei signori dubitarono maggiormente, pur non ne fecero vista, parendoli pur gran cosa che costui, che fa tanta professione di cavaliere, volesse mentire a questo modo. Con tutto ciò per giocar più cautamente che poterono, si risolsero di mettersi in mano l' esclusione di Carpi per ogni caso che potesse occorrere, havendo osservato che il buon Carafa era stato alla cella di Carpi et che si havevano fatto un mondo di carezze et

---

accoglienze.—In somma, venuto il di et l' hora prefissa al termino nostro, il buon Carafa andò a trovar Ghisa et Ferrara et li disse, che li parea meglio a tardar la cosa sin dopo cena a fine che Farnese non sturbasse qualche cosa. Intanto si trattava e da Farnesi e della banda Carafesca l' adoratione di Carpi et in un tratto s' udì una voce per il conclave: Carpi! Carpi! con una piena di cardinali alla volta della sua cella, et il buon Carafa, scoperto l' assassinamento se ne era andato colà per condurlo in cappella. Gaddi et Vitelli della fattione Carafa c' haveano tramato la cosa di Mantova et impegnata la lor fede a Ghisa et Ferrara, sentendo il rumore et mandati a chiamrae da Carafa per non mancar alla fede loro si risolsero di non ci volere andare per modo alcuno, talche Carafa li andò a trovare alla cella et quivi gittandolesi in ginocchio li cominciò a pregare che non volessero mancare all' obbligo che li haveano et alla fedeltà che gli erano obligati di portare, ne per ben che li pregasse e scongiurasse mai ci volsero andare, et si dice anche che vennero a brutte parole et che Vitelli havendoli Carafa detto che l' assassinava, gli rispose che mentiva. In somma non ci fu mai ordine che ci volessero andare, anzi per farsi più forti, si ritirarono alla fattion francese, la quale si stava con l' esclusione di XXVI voti beffandosi et irridendosi di così fatta sbragata. Ultimamente dicono che Guisa disse di brutte parole a Carafa chiamandolo indegno di casa sua et traditore con molte vilanie et che esso non li rispose altro che: Signori, non mi toccate nell' onore. Vero è che non si può ancor sapere ben la cosa precisa, perchè vien da varii variamente detta, ma senza dubbio questo ch' io le scrivo io, è tenuto per certo. Indescribable excitement prevailed in the conclave; Carafa is said to have wept the whole night through. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[1] *Avviso di Roma of December 16, 1559: "si dissero molte villanie et tali che li facchini in ponti a pena potrebbono dirsi peggio. . . . Cose in vero vergognose et indegne a quella congregatione" (Urb. 1039, p. 108b, Vatican Library). *Cf.* Bondonus, 528.

Philip; he also gave the French a plain refusal to work with them.[1]

After the defeat of Gonzaga, the French took up the cause of the aged Pisani; the Spaniards, on the other hand, were most anxious to attempt the elevation of Pacheco, for Philip had written, as early as October 27th, that he would prefer him to anyone else.[2] Full of hope, therefore, they met together for the voting on the morning of December 18th. As Capodiferro and Dandino were dead, and du Bellay had left the conclave on account of illness, the French party had only thirteen Cardinals left, and were no longer of themselves capable of excluding Pacheco. The Spaniards, moreover, had succeeded in getting so many votes for him, that they believed they had one or two more than the necessary number.[3]

In order that no one should prove unfaithful in secret to the Spanish candidate, Carafa proposed at the beginning of the scrutiny that the votes should be given in an unusual and open form.[4] Displeased at this suggestion, the acting dean, Tournon, declared that such a course would be uncanonical and would invalidate the election. Farnese, however, at once replied that nothing but unanimity among the Cardinals was required for a Papal election, and that it was of no importance in what manner that was secured.[5]

Carpi then rose to put an end to the discussion and praised the merits of Pacheco in the most glowing terms, then noisily overturning the table which stood before him, he went up to the latter and greeted him as Pope by kissing his foot. Carafa, Sforza, Farnese and many others[6] followed him; the sick Cardinals, Ghislieri and Saraceni, also came from their cells, led by Alfonso Carafa, to strengthen Pacheco's party.[7]

---

[1] Vargas in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 315.

[2] Vargas on November 30, 1559, *ibid.*, 295.

[3] Vargas on December 21, 1559, *ibid.*, 318.

[4] Thurm, in a letter of September 23, to Ferdinand, puts this proposal in the mouth of Farnese. WAHRMUND, 263.

[5] GUIDUS, 628.

[6] GUIDUS, 628; *cf.* PETRUCELLI, 157.

[7] BONDONUS, 529.

Even a Frenchman, Cardinal Reumano, took part in this rendering of homage, and when he was asked why he gave his vote to a man who had lately refused to give him his, he replied: "Pacheco acted quite rightly in not supporting a man who was unworthy, whereas he had no reason for refusing his vote on that account to one who was worthy."[1] Savelli, on the other hand, took no part in this paying of homage, as he thought it was unfitting for a Roman to assist in elevating a foreigner without necessity.[2]

In the meantime a loud knocking was heard at the door of the conclave; it was said that Cardinal du Bellay had come back and was demanding admission. This was, however, only an unworthy and quite unnecessary attempt to disturb the election,[3] for when Pacheco's adherents were counted, they were found to number only twenty-seven, three votes being still wanting for the necessary majority of two-thirds.[4] Four Cardinals, on whom the Spaniards had counted with certainty, Corgna, Mercurio, Cornaro and Savelli, withdrew at the critical moment. Vargas was especially angry with Corgna, as he believed that if he had voted for Pacheco, the others would certainly have followed him.[5] Corgna thought it necessary to justify his and Mercurio's attitude towards the election of Pacheco, in a letter to Philip II.[6]

---

[1] GUIDUS, 629.

[2] GUIDUS, 628. THURM, *loc. cit.*, 264.

[3] BONDONUS, 529.

[4] According to BONDONUS, 529, Pacheco received 27 votes (Pacheco to Philip II. on December 19, in MÜLLER, 214 n.) and 28 according to Giulio de Grandis, Bishop of Anglona, in PETRUCELLI, 157. Vargas, on the other hand, writes on December 21 "le adoraron hasta veinte y seis de modo que le faltaban tres" (in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 318). Alessandro Farnese writes to Spain on December 29 that the Cardinals of Philip's party had not all voted for Pacheco because he was not an Italian (oltramontano). CARO, III., 269.

[5] Vargas on December 20, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 318.

[6] Corgna to Philip II., on December 20, 1559 (Borghese Archives, now in the Papal Secret Archives in Rome, Ser. 1, n. 206, p. 123

In the afternoon they again tried to elevate Pacheco by a general act of homage, but this time the number of votes was less than in the morning.[1] His adherents, however, did not give up hope. Vargas, at the suggestion of Sforza and Farnese, endeavoured during the night to win back Mercurio to the Spanish party. Then Guise hurried on to the scene and reprimanded the ambassador for interfering in the election.

seqq.); *cf.* Müller, 218. Tiepolo to the Venetian Senate, Toledo, January 30, 1560, in Brown, VII., n. 127. He would willingly have voted for Pacheco, writes Corgna (p. 124), "se non havessi giudicato et per la natura sua tarda et per esser vecchio et mal sano et per qualche altra causa che io restarò di dire a V.M., che fusse poco atto a poter reggere a tanto peso quanto richiede il bisogno de' tempi presenti et le miserie in che truova la povera et afflitta Chiesa.—Nel corso poi di questa negociacione le cose si sono trattate d' un modo che a me non è mai piacciuto, havendo veduto le passioni prevalere al debito et all' honesto.—Finalmente si è venuto al punto di proporre le cose di esso Paceccho et fra molti che non vi hanno consentito, non è parso ne al card. di Messina, ne a me d'adherirli, parte per le cause suddette, a parte per il modo che si è tenuto. Dalla qual risolutione essendosi alterati non solamente il card. Paceccho, ma Vargas ambasciatore di V. M. et vedento non potere colle persuasioni a indurci a questo consenso, si son volti alli protesti, havendo esso Vargas minacciato Ascanio mio fratello et il povero card. di Messina, veramente huomo dabbene, di farli levare tutte l' entrate, che hanno sottoposte a V. M., come se in questo havesse a operarsi contro la conscienza propria per timore della perdita di heni temporali. . . . Rendasi pur certa V. M., che se bene le siamo devotissini et veri servitori, non possiamo però credere, che ella sia per desiderare da noi piu oltra di quello, che la conscienza et la ragion ci detta." Vargas (on December 21, in Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 322) denies that he had threatened a Cardinal with the withdrawal of his benefices, "sino que es invencion de Perosa, por lo que Ascanio so hermano le escribio de suyo, cuando andaba lo de Ferrara."

[1] Thurm in Wahrmund, 264. According to Thurm (*ibid.*) it was "the general opinion" that Sforza, Carafa and Farnese were not in earnest about Pacheco, but that they made a show before Vargas and Pacheco as a proof of their Spanish leanings.

A long altercation, kept indeed within the bounds of courtesy,[1] now took place between the two, owing to which Vargas' attempts to win over Mercurio were seriously hampered. When the ambassador had retired, Guise sent for a workman and had the opening in the wall by which Vargas was in the habit of communicating with the Cardinals walled up.[2]

Vargas' endeavours also proved vain in other directions. The last hopes of the Spanish party of being able to decide upon a Pope of themselves, and by their own power, was shipwrecked with the failure of the candidature of Pacheco. It had become clear that the only way of reaching a decision was by coming to an understanding with the French.[3] By this time most of the Cardinals were so weary of the whole affair that, as Vargas said, they would have elected a piece of wood as Pope, if only to bring matters to an end.[4] On December 22nd and the following days the leaders of the Spanish and French parties arranged meetings in order to agree upon a common candidate.[5] The decision soon lay only between Cesi, who had hitherto not been proposed or rejected, and that Cardinal whom the far-seeing had from the first looked upon as the only possible Pope, Medici.[6]

---

[1] "citra indignationem tamen, immo cum summa benevolentia" (GUIDUS, 629); "con todo tiento de ambas partes" (Vargas in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 321). According to Thurm "nonulli et communiter omnes" asserted that Guise had said to Vargas that he ought to be thrown into the Tiber for having exceeded his authority. WAHRMUND, 264.

[2] GUIDUS, 628 *seq.* BONDONUS, 529. *Cf.* Vargas in DÖLLINGER, I., 320 *seq.*, 321 *seq.* It is not improbable that they had had a window walled up before Vargas' eyes as early as the middle of November. MÜLLER, 198. *Cf.* as to this SÄGMÜLLER, 71, n. 1; MERKLE, II., 529, n. 3.

[3] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 144.

[4] Vargas on December 20, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 317. Concerning Concini's impatience, see his satirical letter of December 16, 1559, in DEMBINSKI, Wybór, 260.

[5] Giulio de Grandis, Bishop of Anglona, on December 23, in PETRUCELLI, 158.

[6] Concerning Medici's prospects *cf. supra* pp. 13, 23 *seq.*, and Vargas *loc. cit.*, 279, 319.

We possess exact details of the last days of the conclave from the pen of Panvinio, who was present at the actual election as an eye-witness, and who also reports as to other matters as the result of exhaustive enquiries.[1] At the beginning of the conclave Cardinal Diomede Carafa had asked Farnese to allow Panvinio to act as his conclavist; Farnese, however, was of the same opinion as many others, and believed that the conclave would last such a short time that it was hardly worth Panvinio's while to allow himself to be shut up there.[2] When Christmas, however, was approaching, and many confessors were summoned to the conclave in preparation for the feast, Farnese arranged that Panvinio should also come in on December 24th.[3]

Panvinio found the Cardinals by no means in expectation of an election. Carpi, whom he visited first of all, said to him that if a Pope were not elected on that day or the next, he very much feared that the conclave might last for another six months.[4] The negotiations of the party leaders had by this time brought about the result that the decision now lay between Cesi and Medici, but in other respects very great difficulties lay in the way of both of them.[5] The Spaniards were on the side of Medici, while the French were more inclined to Cesi, although they were not actually averse to Medici. Carafa's party could not agree among themselves; the influential Cardinal Vitelli was decidedly in favour of Medici, while the Cardinal of Naples was against him and for Cesi; Carafa himself was undecided.[6]

---

[1] Panvinius, De creatione Pii IV. papae, in MERKLE, II., 575-601. To a certain extent Panvinius agrees exactly with Guidus; e.g. *cf.* GUIDUS, 630, 5 *seq.*, with PANVINIUS, 581, 41 *seq.*; GUIDUS, 630, 1, with PANVINIUS, 580, 20; GUIDUS, 630, 16, with PANVINIUS, 583, 1.

[2] PANVINIUS, 577.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] *Ibid.*, 578.

[5] "Ingentes etiam nunc difficultates superesse": GUIDUS, 630; "ingentes difficultates in utrisque superesse constabat": PANVINIUS, 580.

[6] PANVINIUS, 580.

When Panvinio visited various Cardinals on the afternoon of the following day, the feast of Christmas, the position was considerably altered. Madruzzo and Truchsess regarded the election of Medici, with which they were not particularly pleased, as being practically certain, Cesi being no longer spoken of.[1] Panvinio believed, nevertheless, that the election would still take some time, and in the evening begged Cardinal Farnese to allow him to go into the city. Farnese, however, encouraged him to remain, as he thought the election was actually impending.[2]

Affairs had almost suddenly taken a turn. On December 21st it had been seriously debated whether the conclave should not be dissolved before Christmas and only resumed after the Epiphany,[3] but as early as the following day the decisive moment was approaching. After dinner Carafa and Vitelli accidentally met Cardinal Guise, and a conversation ensued during the course of which Guise at last asked Carafa why the election was being postponed, to which the other replied that it was not his fault. Then Guise made the remark that as far as he was concerned, who was soon leaving Rome, it was immaterial who was Pope, provided that the Cardinal elected was fitted for the position ; as, however, the candidates proposed by the French had been rejected, the honour of his nation made it necessary that they should not accept the candidates of the Spaniards, but must give their votes to someone else. In saying this Guise had clearly indicated Cesi, who had, hitherto, neither been seriously proposed nor rejected. Vitelli thereupon remarked that it was not right to reject a worthy candidate on such grounds, as it was of no consequence to which party he belonged as long as he was worthy. Guise answered that he quite understood the meaning of this rejoinder : Vitelli intended by what he said to recommend Medici. He on his side, and as a proof of his good will, would propose two candidates on the part of the French, Cesi and Medici. Let them select one of these two, and the French would vote for him. At the same time, Guise added a condition to this promise: Alfonso Carafa must also give his approval to the candidate upon whom his uncle should decide.[1] Alfonso had previously played no important part in the conclave; it was only when Carlo Carafa had made himself unpopular with his own party, by his perpetual hesitation, that Alfonso had risen in the esteem of his adherents.[2]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 578. [2] *Ibid.*, 579. [3] *Ibid.*, 580-1.

It was easy to tell in what manner the decision between Medici and Cesi would be made. Cesi was thought to have French leanings, and this recommended him to the Cardinals as little as the fact that he was not particularly agreeable to the Spanish king.[3] The case was different with Medici. It is true that he had so far come into very little prominence in the conclave; he had been unwell when he arrived and he had been confined to his bed almost ever since.[4] He received but few votes in the scrutinies,[5] and none of the influential Cardinals showed any particular wish for his election. On the other hand it was very greatly in his favour that he was regarded as an acceptable candidate at both the French and Spanish courts, and, finally, his candidature was the only measure to which they could now have recourse, when all other attempts had failed. Vargas, who was one of the most important figures in the negotiations, had written, a few days after his arrival in Rome, that they might attempt the candidature of Medici when everything else had failed, but, he added, he would prefer someone else.[6] Later on he was less guarded in his remarks.[1] Alessandro Farnese had long ago been pledged[2] by express promises to work for Medici; it was only to protect himself against Gonzaga that for a time he kept his wishes in abeyance and followed Carafa's lead. Sforza stood firmly on the side of Medici; as Guise and the French now also declared themselves for him, it was only necessary that Carlo and Alfonso Carafa should join his party to turn the scales.[3]

---

[1] *Ibid.*, 581.

[2] He is mentioned with distinction side by side with C. Carafa, e.g. by Concini on December 16 (PETRUCELLI, 156) by Vargas on December 21 (DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 319, 320).

[3] Alessandro Farnese writes on December 29, 1559, that Cesi had been put on one side, "per esser nominato da' Francesi, e perchè per l' ultima vostra m' accennaste che non era servizio di Sua Maestà." CARO, III., 270. *Cf.* Vargas on October 18, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 279.

[4] ALBÈRI, II., 4, 61.

[5] See the *List of scrutinies (State Library, Munich) in Appendix No. 1.

[6] Vargas to Philip II., on September 28, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 270.

With the assent of Guise the result of the election was, in the opinion of Vitelli, decided in Medici's favour.[4] During the last few days Carlo Carafa had leaned strongly to his side, while Vargas and Farnese kept putting him forward as well.[5] It was of decisive importance that Cosimo de' Medici now judged that the moment had arrived for taking definite steps in favour of his candidate. By means of Vitelli the Florentine agents caused letters to be shown to Cardinal Carlo Carafa in which Cosimo made great promises to the nephews of Paul IV.[6] In these he said that he would endeavour to obtain for Carafa compensation from Philip II. for Paliano; he also promised that he would remain neutral in the struggle going on between the Marquis Antonio Carafa and the Count of Bagno concerning Montebello, although he had hitherto been against Antonio. On the strength of these promises Carlo Carafa went over to the side of Medici.[7]

---

[1] Vargas to Philip on October 18 and December 21, 1559, *ibid.*, 279, 319.

[2] Šusta, Pius IV., 149, n. 1.

[3] Vargas writes on December 21, concerning Medici: "Este creo que a esta hora tiene mas derecho, si Napoles se ablanda, y Ferrara viene en el de buen pie, que Carafa no esta ya en escluirlo, como antes;" in Döllinger, I., 319.

[4] Panvinius, 581.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] Šusta, Pius IV., 149.

[7] According to Riess, 392, Cosimo promised Carafa 300,000 scudi in the event of Philip refusing him a territorial indemnification for Paliano. An "obviously (?) well-informed contemporary" according to Riess, 407, whose anonymous report is dated from

It was more difficult for Vitelli to induce the Cardinal of Naples, Alfonso Carafa, to join the party of Medici. Alfonso was under the influence of his father, Antonio Carafa, Marquis of Montebello, who had no confidence in the promises of Cosimo, and who therefore recommended his son to support Cesi, who had been the confidential friend of the late Pope. The latter, moreover, had never cared for Medici.[1] In addition to all this there was the decisive fact that Alfonso was not convinced of the perfect orthodoxy of Medici, in the matter of the concessions to the Protestants.[2] At first Vitelli, despite long discussion, could obtain no more than the promise that Alfonso would carefully consider the matter.[3]

On the following day, as well, Vitelli accomplished nothing, and Alfonso remained firm. On the 24th the plans of Medici's friends reached the ears of his opponents, and they at once attacked Alfonso Carafa, beseeching him to separate from his uncle's party. Carlo Carafa no sooner heard of this than he rushed to his nephew and by dint of scolding, imploring and threatening him, he worked, with the support of Vitelli, on the young Cardinal of Naples in such a way that he at last agreed to remain with his party.[4]

In the meantime the interests of Medici were being zealously promoted by the Florentine envoys. They promised in the

---

Venice, says that the Pope went to law with the Carafa family so that Cosimo might regain this written promise and the affair not be brought to light.

[1] "Leviusculum, vanum et, ut dicitur, cerebrellinum appellare solebat" (PANVINIUS, 582). Paul IV. had openly reprimanded Cardinal Medici in consistory because he had endeavoured to obtain the archbishopric of Milan by unjustifiable means. (*ibid.* 589, n. h.).

[2] "Napoli si è lasciato intendere, che per niuno conto vole dare il voto suo a Medici, sendo, come dicono, sospetto di heresia; pare che hebbe questo per ricordo dalla santa memoria di papa Paulo IV." Thus writes Caligari, the agent of Carafa, in November, to Antonio Carafa, in ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 150, n. 1.

[3] PANVINIUS, 582.

[4] *Ibid.*

name of the future Pope that Montebello and Paliano should be entrusted to the sequestrator of the Apostolic Camera until the settlement of the dispute, and that the Pope, in union with Duke Cosimo, would apply to Philip II. in favour of Carafa. Antonio Carafa allowed himself to be won over, and now influenced his son Alfonso in the sense desired by Cosimo.[1] By this a most important victory had been won for Medici.[2]

On the morning of Christmas Day, Vitelli prepared himself for another attack on Alfonso Carafa. This time he laid before him a letter of recommendation of Medici which Duke Cosimo had addressed to the Cardinal of Naples two months before, but which Vitelli had intercepted and kept back. In this letter the Duke recommended his candidate with great urgency and many promises, though he did not go beyond mere generalities.[3] When Vitelli showed his want of satisfaction with this, Cosimo's ambassador, Bartolomeo Concini, had recourse, on Vitelli's advice, to similar measures to those used by Vargas. He drew up, in the name of the Duke, a letter of four pages to Vitelli,[4] in which a promise was made that all the possessions of the Carafa should remain under the care of the Apostolic Camera until Philip II. had arranged an equivalent for them, and Fabrizio di Sangro, a conclavist of Carlo Carafa, was to repair as the ambassador of the new Pope to Madrid immediately after the election, there to work in the interests of the Carafa.[5] It was not generally known that Philip II. had already, two months previously, decided concerning Paliano in favour of the Colonna. Alfonso was now won over and agreed to the elevation of Medici. Vitelli brought the momentous news to Cardinal Guise on the afternoon of Christmas Day; thereupon the party leaders, Guise, Este, Sforza, Carlo Carafa, and Farnese held a meeting and fixed on the following morning for the election of Medici.[1]

---

[1] Šusta, Pius IV., 150. Sebastiano Gualterio received special instructions from Vitelli on December 23, as to how he was to influence the hesitating Marquis. Šusta, Kurie, I., lxxii n.

[2] Concini wrote to Cosimo as early as December 2: "Farnese me fait dire que toute l' affaire de Medici c' est d' arranger celle de don Antonio Carafa;" in Petrucelli, 153.

[3] Panvinius, 582.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Šusta, Pius IV., 150. *Cf.* Vargas to Philip II., on December 29, 1559, in Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 325. See also Caro, III., 271.

Medici was not fully informed of all this until his election was practically assured. Vitelli brought him the first definite news,[2] and the affair soon became known throughout the whole conclave; the last doubt vanished when, in the evening, the Cardinal of Naples, accompanied by Vitelli, paid a visit to Medici. A general stir now sprang up in the conclave. Carpi still made some attempt to collect votes against Medici, but as he had no party leader on his side, he could not count on any success. On the other hand a long line of Cardinals streamed to Medici's cell, both before and after the evening meal; everyone wished to speak to him and to congratulate him. Vitelli came for a long consultation after Alfonso Carafa had gone, and Medici expressed a wish to see Guise or Este the same evening; he would not retire to rest before he had spoken to one of them. On account of the interchange of compliments, however, the appearance of the two Cardinals was still delayed, which was most unpleasant for Vitelli and Medici, as they wished the election to take place immediately after the visit of the two leaders.[1]

---

[1] GUIDUS, 630; PANVINIUS, 582. Several smaller matters were arranged without difficulty. Este and Gonzaga were promised the red hat for their nephews, Rebiba received the assurance that the *spoilium* of his predecessor in the archbishopric should be his, although the brief assigning it to him was of doubtful validity, as it was dated the day of the death of Paul IV. ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 151.

[2] GUIDUS, 630; PANVINIUS, 583. Medici, however, said to the Duchess of Urbino on December 23, that he thought he would certainly be elected, but he did not know if he were capable of bearing such a burden (ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 150, in Cod. Vat. 7039, Vatican Library). Carpi maintained later that Medici had bought his election from Alfonso for a large sum of money, and that Antonio Carafa had afterwards had a written promise concerning the transaction in his possession. This story proves, at all events, the real importance of Alfonso in the election of Pius IV. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 19, 2, 3.

In the meantime various Cardinals remained standing round the cell of the chosen Cardinal until long after midnight. Panvinio also remained near at hand to watch the proceedings. As Carlo Carafa had engaged the celebrated scholar in conversation, Panvinio took the liberty of putting in a word and asking when the election would take place. At the answer, "Early to-morrow morning," Morone, who was rather surprised, asked whether they would really wait so long. Panvinio replied in the affirmative, but added politely that he really saw no reason why the election should not be made at once. Morone was of the same opinion and began to exhort the Cardinals to proceed without delay. All agreed, and only Carlo Carafa appeared to have a scruple owing to the fact that many of the Cardinals had already retired for the night.[2] However, they sent to Guise, Sforza and Este in order to inform them of the wishes of some twelve electors assembled at Medici's cell. Guise soon came with Vitelli and entered the cell for a short conversation. In the meantime Sforza, Farnese, Este and others whom Panvinio had awakened appeared on the scene. Many had already assembled in the place of election, and Madruzzo, who was suffering acutely from gout, was carried in a chair. Medici was then led in by Alfonso Carafa and Este. The Papal throne was placed before the altar and all the Cardinals, including Medici, took their places in the usual order of rank. The conclavists crowded in and, at Panvinio's request, were allowed to remain.[3] The acting dean, Tournon, now arose and declared that he elected Medici as Pope, the others making a similar declaration.[1] Then the elected Cardinal was raised to the throne, and the usual homage paid to him to the great joy of all, even the sick Cardinals having themselves carried in to take part in the ceremony.[2]

---

[1] PANVINIUS, 583.

[2] *Ibid.*, 584; *cf.* GUIDUS, 630. BONDONUS, 530: "Et cum omnes certatim properarent in congratulando, ill^{mus} cardinalis Carafa opposuit se ante portam camerae cardinalis de Medicis omnibus venientibus, eosque rogans ne ad praefatum Ill^{mum} accederent, et eum sinerent quiescere, et quod in mane sequenti tempus erit ad hoc faciendum."

[3] PANVINIUS, 584.

When Carlo Carafa paid homage, he begged the Pope to forgive the Roman people everything they had done against Paul IV., and the house of Carafa, as he would himself forget and forgive all these occurrences. The Pope at first refused decidedly to grant this request, as he must give an example of severity. It was only when Sforza and Farnese impetuously supported Carafa that he yielded, emphasizing the fact that he did so for the sake of Carafa, but that indemnification must be made for the damage done.[3] He firmly refused, on the other hand, the pardon requested by Sforza for Pompeo Colonna, who had murdered his mother-in-law; the acquittal of the murderer of a relative, he declared, should not be the first act of his pontificate.[4]

After the ceremony of paying homage was concluded, the newly-elected Pope declared, in answer to the question of Este and others, that he would take the name of Pius, because he wished to be what the name signified. The doors of the conclave had, in the meantime, been broken open, and the news of the election which had just taken place, spread rapidly through the city. On the following morning, December 26th, the election was confirmed in the usual way, by a scrutiny, and the newly-elected Pope was carried into St. Peter's, where the Cardinals again paid him homage. He then repaired to the Vatican amid such mighty cries of joy that, as Panvinio writes, one could scarcely distinguish the thunder of the cannon, fired in honour of the occasion, from the acclamations of the people.[1]

---

[1] Bondonus had to take note of the votes given by word of mouth and to count them. BONDONUS, 530.

[2] PANVINIUS, 585.

[3] *Ibid.*; GUIDUS, 631. "Con questo il Carafa tornerà in gratia de' Romani," writes Bart. Ferentillo to Alberico Cybo-Malaspina, on January 2, 1560. Archivio storico Lombardo, Ser. 3, ann. 23, 161 (1896).

[4] GUIDUS, 631. FERENTILLO, *loc. cit.* "Questi primi saggi," remarks Ferentillo, "dan speranra, che Dio . . . ci habbi dato un buon papa."

The election had an unpleasant sequel for Vargas. Philip II. was not pleased with the over-zealous proceedings of his ambassador, nor with the means which he had employed. On January 8th, 1560,[2] before the result of the conclave was known in Spain, the king commissioned Francisco de Mendoza to go to Rome and earnestly urge the Cardinals to hasten the election. At the same time he gave him a letter for Vargas. Shortly before the departure of Mendoza, that is on January 8th, the news of the election of Pius IV. arrived, and Mendoza's journey was abandoned. The letter for Vargas, however, was still sent to Rome.[3]

In this important letter[4] the king first expresses his regret that in spite of the troubled state of Christendom the election of a worthy Pope had not yet taken place. It caused him great pain and sorrow that the passions and personal feelings of the Cardinals should have entailed such consequences. To combat this recourse should not have been had to such measures as gifts of money, as had been done by Vargas and the Viceroy of Naples, and just as little could the promise of indemnification for Paliano be justified.[5] Vargas must never again make use of such means, but must rather employ such as would not jeopardize the king's good name. If Carafa was not satisfied with general promises, such as could be given without weighing on one's conscience, then the ambassador had no right to give further pledges in the name of his sovereign. God, Who knew the king's intentions, and Who had the situation in His keeping, would find a way out of the difficulty, which would be in keeping with the dignity of His service. Philip also blamed Vargas for having openly opposed Gonzaga and having thereby drawn down upon the king the enmity of the Italian princes. He complained of the divisions in the Spanish party and of the Cardinals' want of discretion in openly announcing that they were waiting for the royal courier and his decision. Finally, Philip declared his fear that the world would accuse him of having been the cause of the delay in the election; it was certainly not his wish that the Church should remain any longer without a chief pastor because of any special interests of his own. Without excluding or naming anyone, he instructed the ambassador to exhort and call upon the Cardinals in the king's name to choose a good Pope without delay, such a one as the Church needed, and who was worthy of such a high office. If they acted in this manner the king would be gracious to them, and would honour and promote them as persons who perform what is required of them for the service of God and the king. In the other case, however, the king would be compelled to act towards them in a manner that would be most unpleasant to himself.

---

[1] PANVINIUS, 586.

[2] Letter of the Venetian ambassador, Paolo Tiepolo, from Toledo on January 30, 1560, in BROWN, VII., n. 127, p. 148.

[3] MÜLLER, 204; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 142.

[4] HINOJOSA, 101 *seqq.*; MÜLLER, 204 *seqq.*; HERRE, 57 *seqq.*

[5] Concerning the "Chapter" which Vargas had drawn up in the King's name at the beginning of December (*supra* p. 47), Philip as yet knew nothing. Here, therefore, it is a question of the earlier promise in the second half of November (*supra* p. 39).

In the instructions for Francisco de Mendoza,[1] issued at the same time, but which were no longer in force since the election was already accomplished, the king says that he would, at any rate, prefer the exclusion of Gonzaga, but that if this could not be carried out, Vargas was to put the general interest before the private wishes of the king. A concession of such importance goes a long way to prove that Philip was in earnest in his oft repeated assurance that in the Papal election he had in view, above all things, the well-being of the Church.

Vargas answered the complaints of the king in a long letter of defence,[2] which is expressed in rather self-assured terms, drawing attention to the fact that the election was actually decided in the sense wished by the king, and for a Cardinal belonging to the Spanish party. If he hoped thereby to secure for himself a brilliant career he was very much mistaken. He had recommended himself very little to his sovereign by exceeding his instructions, and failing to understand his intentions. Pius IV. was very indignant when Vargas informed him on December 29th of the promises which he had made to Cardinal Carafa in the name of the king, and without his authority.[1] He had also made many enemies by his exaggerated zeal during the conclave. His position as ambassador in Rome was thus very difficult from the first.

---

[1] See Müller, 206 *seq.*

[2] Printed in Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 329-335. *Cf.* Šusta, Pius IV., 142.

---

[1] Vargas to Philip II. on December 29, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, I., 325. Vargas answered the angry Pontiff that if there had been no cheating Pius IV. would not be Pope.

CHAPTER II.

PREVIOUS LIFE AND CHARACTER OF PIUS IV. THE BEGINNING OF HIS PONTIFICATE.

CARDINAL GIAN ANGELO DE' MEDICI who was elected Pope after a conclave of three and a half months and was crowned on January 6th 1560,[1] had not up to this time, in any respect, played an important part. He was a native of Milan, and was born there on Easter Sunday (March 31st), 1499, being the son of Bernardino de' Medici and his wife, Cecilia Serbelloni.

The Medici of Milan, who could trace their history back to the XIVth century, belonged to the less important patrician families of the capital of Lombardy. Their coat of arms was a golden ball on a red field, and they were in no way related to the celebrated family of the same name in Florence. Several members of the family practised as doctors in Milan, but most of them turned their attention to jurisprudence and practised as notaries.[2] This was the case with Bernardino de' Medici, who, to distinguish him from the other branches of the family, was surnamed "di Nosigia," because he belonged to the parish of San Martino di Nosigia. He was known as an industrious and honourable man,[1] who by his marriage with Cecilia Serbelloni became the father of fourteen children, of whom ten, five sons and five daughters, survived. In order to support this numerous family Bernardino de' Medici endeavoured to increase his income by the farming of the customs. After the victory of Francis I. at Marignano, on September 14th, 1515, had placed Milan in the hands of the French, he lost, as an adherent of Maximilian Sforza, not only this concession, but also his whole fortune, and was, moreover, thrown into prison, from which he was only released through the intercession of a friend, Girolamo Morone. Completely broken in health by his misfortunes, Bernardino died in 1519,[2] leaving his family in very necessitous circumstances. The eldest son, Gian Giacomo, a bold and adventurous character, who had been obliged to flee from Milan, adopted the career of arms.[3] The second son, Gian Angelo, went to Pavia, where he at first studied medicine and philosophy, but later, following the family tradition, turned his attention to jurisprudence, which was, indeed, more suited to his temperament. The misfortunes of his father placed him in such dire need, that he was thrown on the charity of his fellow students, and was thankful, through the influence of the friend of his family, Morone, to accept a free place in the college founded by Cardinal Branda. He continued his juridical studies in the hope of succeeding in his efforts to obtain a position as notary in Milan.[1] His manner of life, however, was completely altered by the turn of political affairs in the north of Italy.

---

[1] An *Avviso di Roma of January 6, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p.114, Vatican Library) announces that Pius IV. wished that the pomp should be moderate and the surplus given to the poor. Forty persons were crushed to death in the crowds. See the sources in CANCELLIERI, 109 ; *cf.* also the pamphlets : La felice creatione et coronatione d. S^{ta} di N.S.Pio IV. con le feste et livree fatte dalli sig. Romani (s. l. et a. , and : Gewisse Zeytung mit was Pracht u. Gepreng im Anfang des 1560 Jars zu Rom gekrönt sey der yetsige Pabst Pius IV. (s. l et a.).

[2] *Cf.* the work of CALVI : Famiglie Milanesi, IV., Milan 1885, and ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 9 *seq.*, 155 *seq.*, whose details given in the Czech language have hitherto been little known, although they form the most complete record of the previous history of Pius IV. that we possess. Here, too (p. 159 *seq.*) we have the first thorough criticism of Panvinius as a biographer of Pius IV. *Cf.* Appendix No. 37.

---

[1] Girol. Soranzo, 68. In Cod. D. 325 of the Ambrosian Library at Milan, there is a picture of the house of Bernardino de' Medici, with the original coat of arms. *Cf.* Beltrami, Sul valore dei terreni in Milano al principio del 1500, Milan, 1891, and Rassegna d'Arte, XIV. 140 *seq.* (1914).

[2] *Cf.* Lettere di G. Morone, in the Miscell. di stor, Ital., II., 713. Šusta, Pius IV., 10.

[3] The work of his contemporary, Marcantonio Missaglia, furnishes reliable statements concerning his adventurous life: Vita di Giov. Jacomo Medici, marchese di Marignano, Milan, 1605 (con noti di M. Fabi, Milan, 1854). *Cf.* also Giangiacomo de Medici Castellano di Musso (1523-32). Saggio bibliografico di Solone Ambrosoli, Milan, 1805.

In consequence of the capture of Milan by the Papal-Imperial army on November 19th, 1521, and the return of Francesco Sforza to his capital, everything was changed. Better days had now come for the Medici family, while, more important still, Gian Giacomo had won the implicit confidence of the all-powerful chancellor, Morone. The reckless soldier became a tool in the hands of Morone, and as a reward for a political murder he received the fortress of Musso in feudal tenure from the Duke.[2] In this eyrie, on the steep western bank of the Lake of Como, between Dongo and Rezzonico, of which only picturesque ruins now remain, he made the whole neighbourhood unsafe, under the pretence of fighting the French. In the confusion which prevailed in the whole district round Milan, and protected by Morone, the Castellan of Musso, generally spoken of as Il Musso, was able to allow himself many liberties and became the terror of the neighbourhood. His aspirations were plainly directed to the foundation of an independent sovereignty. This soldier, now twenty-eight years old, thus stands out as a type of those daring, ruthless and powerful condottieri, of whom the days of the Renaissance offer so many examples.[3]

The prosperity of Gian Giacomo was naturally of the greatest advantage to his whole family. Gian Angelo was now in a position to complete his legal studies at the University of Bologna, where he enjoyed the tuition of the famous Carlo Ruini, and in 1525 won his doctor's degree in both branches of the law. On his return to Milan he was immediately received as a member of the *Collegio dei nobili giuresconsulti*.[1] He owed this honour to the influence of Morone, who intended to make use of the young man for his secret political plans. Gian Angelo, as well as his brother, Gian Giacomo, was involved in the plot which Morone had set on foot for the liberation of Italy from the Spanish yoke, but the discovery of the conspiracy, which led to the imprisonment of Morone, ruined all their hopes. The two Medici, who were deeply compromised, fled to Musso, which was strongly fortified, and the Spaniards were not powerful enough to take energetic measures against them. When the Holy League was formed against the Emperor after the Peace of Madrid, Gian Giacomo, the skilled soldier, took part in the campaign against the Spaniards.[2] A quarrel in which he was involved with the commander- in-chief of the Venetians, the Duke of Urbino, was the occasion of sending his brother, Gian Angelo, to Rome at the end of 1526.[3] While Gian Angelo was diplomatically active against the Spaniards, the Castellan of Musso was waging a guerilla war against them. This daring soldier gave so much trouble to the Imperial leader, de Leva, that the latter resolved to make peace with him. Gian Giacomo, who always had an eye to his own interests, agreed all the more willingly to de Leva's offer as the League was falling to pieces. He entered, without scruple, into the service of the Emperor, who recognised him by patent, on October 31st, 1528, as

---

[1] *Cf.* Lettere di G. Morone, *loc. cit.*, 690; GIROL. SORANZO, 70; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 11.

[2] See MISSAGLIA, 15 *seq.* The romantic episode included in Ranke (Päpste, I^{6}., 206) and Brosch (I., 225) in their account as to the way in which Gian Giacomo became master of Musso, has been shown by Šusta (Pius IV., 12) to be a fable, though of very ancient date, since it appears in Mocenigo, 50.

[3] *Cf.* BURCKHARDT, Kultur der Renaissance, I^{10}., 29 and 181, Leipsic, 1908, the latter dealing with Gian Giacomo's relations with Aretino.

---

[1] The Pope in returning thanks for the congratulations of the College, referred to this; see the *brief of March 26, 1560, to the Collegium iuriscons. Mediol. (Arm. 43, t. 10, n. 136, Papal Secret Archives). Concerning C. Ruini *cf.* FANTUZZI, VII., 230 *seq.;* SAVIGNY, Gesch. des röm. Rechts, VI., 426.

[2] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 12 *seq.*

[3] See *ibid.*, 13-14. *Cf.* MÜLLER, 231.

Marquis of Musso and Count of Lecco.[1] It was only towards the north that his sovereignty could be extended, and, therefore Gian Giacomo at once sought to secure an alliance by marrying his sister Chiara to Count Mark Sittich of Hohenems in the Vorarlberg, and at the same time formed other plans for the further extension of his power. For his brother, who was still in Rome and had become a Protonotary there, he had already procured a benefice *in commendam* at Mazzo in Valtellina, and now Gian Angelo was about to be elevated to the bishopric of Chur. The Protestant inhabitants of the Grisons, however, accused Abbot Theodore Schlegel, who was governing that diocese as vicar-general, of having secretly furthered this plan, and caused the unhappy man to be executed, after being horribly tortured, and in spite of his repeated protestations of his innocence, on January 23rd, 1529.[2] This put an end to the plan of Gian Angelo becoming Bishop of Chur.

Still more painful was the blow which the year 1529 was to bring to the Medici family. The Emperor concluded peace with Francesco Sforza, and Gian Giacomo repaired personally to Bologna for the protection of his interests. Here he learned that investiture was to be refused to him, and that his sole remaining hope was the intercession of Clement VII. Gian Angelo, who had become closely associated with the Pope during the terrible days of the sack of the city, was working personally for this end in Bologna, but his influence proved insufficient, and the treaty of December 23rd, 1529, put an end to the sovereignty of Gian Giacomo.[3] The Duke of Milan, however, had not got the necessary force to compel the Castellan of Musso to relinquish his possessions. He was still less able to do so when Gian Giacomo found a powerful intercessor in Duke Charles III. of Savoy, who succeeded, in January, 1531, on the basis of the *status quo*, in arranging a temporary peace between Gian Giacomo and Francesco Sforza.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* CALVI, Fam. Milan, tav. 3; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 14-15. See also BERRETTA, Gian Giacomo de' Medici in Brianza, 1527-31, in the Arch. stor. Lomb., XLIII., 1-2 (1916).

[2] *Cf.* MOOR, Geschichte von Kurrätien, II., 1, 109 *seqq.*; Kath. Schweitzer Blätter, I., 227 *seqq.*; VII., 432 *seq.*; WEISS, Basels Anteil am Kriege gegen Gian Giacomo de Medici, 1531-2, 50, Basle, 1902; J. C. MAYER, St. Luzi bei Chur², 50-62, Einsiedeln, 1907.

[3] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 16-17. Šusta believes that the idea of connecting the genealogical tree of the Medici of Milan with that of the Florentine family, first arose after the sack of Rome. For details see *infra* p. 77.

The Castellan of Musso soon showed that his bold and ambitious spirit was still unbroken. The aggravation of the differences between the Catholics and those of the new religion in Switzerland offered him a favourable opportunity for angling in troubled waters. The celebrated "Musso War," a prelude to the "Kappel War," began in March, 1531.[2] In this enterprise Gian Giacomo had only his own personal ends in view, which he cleverly sought to disguise under the pretence of religious zeal. He assured the Emperor, the Pope, and the Italian princes that his intention was to subdue the Swiss, who were hostile to the Italians and steeped in abominable heresies. Gian Angelo, who, after the failure at Bologna, had left the Curia, was actively working in the same sense, and was now serving his brother as chancellor.[3] All efforts, however, to interest the Pope and the Catholic powers in the struggle in Switzerland were unavailing. The Duke of Milan even made common cause with the inhabitants of the Grisons and accepted, by the treaty of May 7th, 1531, the command in the war, and especially of the seige of Musso.[4] In spite of this the experienced condottiere was able to hold his own until the following year, and it was only when the mission of Gian Angelo, in the winter of 1531, to the conference at Baden, had broken down, that no choice remained to him but to accept the hard conditions of peace laid down by the conqueror. Gian

---

[1] See ŠUSTA, *loc. cit.*, 17.

[2] *Cf.* ZELLER-WERDMÜLLER, Der Krieg gegen den Tyrannen von Musso, Zurich, 1883; JOLLER in the Kath. Scheitzer Blättern, IV. (1862); GHINZONI in Bollett. stor. d. Svizz. Ital., XV., 140 *seq.* (1893); WEISS, *loc. cit.* where there are further literary statements.

[3] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 17 *seq.*

[4] See Eidgenössische Abschiede, IV., 1b, 977, 563 *seq.*; GIUSSANI Il Forte di Fuentes, 365 *seq.*, Como, 1905.

Angelo, as the fully authorized representative of his brother, signed the treaty of peace with the Duke Francesco Sforza and the eight Cantons, on February 13th, 1532; Gian Giacomo had to relinquish all his possessions in exchange for a money indemnity and the title of Marquis of Marignano.[1] The fortress of Musso was demolished, and its former master was forced at last to give up his ambitious schemes of one day acquiring an independent principality. He then went, with his brothers Gian Battista and Agosto to Savoy. Gian Angelo returned to Rome, where he was soon able to form new ties in addition to the influential connections which he had already made. It is not, therefore, surprising that he succeeded in obtaining a Papal brief in July, 1532, which recommended his elder brother to the Duke of Savoy. In this document Clement VII. alluded to a family connection with the Medici of Milan, probably to win the support of the experienced soldier, Gian Giacomo, by the flattering fiction.[2] In the year 1534 Gian Giacomo served the Duke of Savoy against Berne and Geneva,[3] and two years later he appears in the pay of the Emperor, who was a brother-in-law of the Duke, at the siege of Turin, which the French were investing. After the failure of this undertaking, he fell under the suspicion of holding a traitorous intercourse with the French, whereupon the Imperial Viceroy in Milan, Guasto, caused him and his brother Gian Battista to be arrested at the end of 1536. The proceedings for high treason which were taken against him, however, had no result.[4]

---

[1] See Eidgenössische Abschiede, IV., 1b, 1578-83; Weiss, *loc. cit.*, 98 *seq.*

[2] In the *brief, dated Rome, July 27, 1532, to which Šusta (Pius IV., 22, 157) first drew attention, we read: "Intelleximus dil. fil. Ioannem Iacobum Medicem de Mus marchionem Marignani se istuc in quaedam nobilitatis tuas loca contulisse." He rejoices at the kind reception accorded to him: "cum eum nostrae familiae addictissimum esse scires, quae quidem necessitudinis causa ad marchionem ipsum tibi commendandum potissimum nos moveret," which however was not at all necessary. (Arch. S. Angelo, Arm. 11, caps. I., 239, Papal Secret Archives).

[3] *Cf.* Weiss, *loc. cit.*, 145.

[4] *Cf.* Missaglia, 112 *seq.*; Šusta, Pius IV., 24 *seq.*

Gian Angelo de' Medici, whose protector, Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, had ascended the Papal throne on October 13th, 1534, now devoted all his powers to procuring the liberation of his imprisoned brothers. The new Pope had already in the first years of his reign entrusted the administration of Ascoli Piceno in the Marches to the astute Lombard,[1] and Gian Angelo went to Città di Castello in 1535, and to Parma in 1536 in the same capacity. His unwearied efforts for the liberation of his imprisoned brothers, to which, among other documents, a letter in his own hand of May 24th, 1537, still preserved in the Vatican Archives, testifies,[2] were at last to be crowned with success. When the meeting of Paul III. and Charles V. took place in the summer of 1538 at Nice, Gian Angelo also went there, and by the Pope's intercession he succeeded in inducing the Emperor to order his brothers to be set at liberty, whereupon Gian Giacomo again joined the army of Charles V., and won his favour in an increasing degree.[3]

Gian Angelo, meanwhile, still filled the difficult yet by no means exalted office of an official in the administration of the States of the Church. He was Governor of Fano in 1539, and in the following year filled the same office for a second time in Parma. His faithful service at length resulted in his being appointed in 1542 apostolic commissary to the troops which Paul III. sent to Hungary to assist King Ferdinand against the Turks. Here he met his brother, Gian Giacomo, who was commanding the Danube fleet, but who severely criticized the policy of the commander-in-chief, the Elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg, in a memorandum which, as the complete failure of the enterprise proved, was fully justified.[4]

---

[1] Concerning the slow promotion of Gian Angelo in the Curia see Panvinius (*cf.* Appendix No. 37).

[2] Šusta (*loc. cit.* 24) was also the first to draw attention to this *document (Carte Farnes. VI., Papal Secret Archives).

[3] See the letter of Charles V. to his brother in the Venetian despatches, I., 475, n. 2. See also Navagero in ALBÈRI, I., 1, 309.

[4] *Cf.* Vol. XII. of this work, p. 144, and ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 25. The reports of Gian Angelo are printed in the Mon. Hung. dipl., XVI., Budapesth, 1879.

On his return from Hungary to Italy, Gian Angelo settled a boundary dispute between Bologna and Ferrara, and afterwards again accompanied the troops with which Paul III. supported the Turkish war of Ferdinand I., after which the Pope invested him with the administration of Ancona and gave him the rank of Papal Referendarius.[1] Gian Giacomo had in the meantime been rendering the Emperor excellent service in the war against Cleves and France, and as a reward he was, in January, 1545, invested with Tre Pievi, on the lake of Como.[2]

A matrimonial alliance which Gian Angelo successfully negotiated with the assistance of the friendly Duke of Florence, had a decisive influence on the further advancement of both the brothers.[3] While Gian Giacomo was still employed at the seat of war, the daughter of Ludovico Orsini, Count of Pitigliano, and sister-in-law of the powerful Pier Luigi Farnese, was married to him by proxy in October 1545. The result was that Gian Angelo at length attained to a higher position. When his patron, Alessandro Farnese, had been raised to the Papal throne in 1534, Gian Angelo had hoped for speedy promotion, but the far-seeing Pope, especially in the early years of his reign, had shown scrupulous care in his choice of his higher officials, and he had contented himself with employing the worldly-minded Lombard, who was also not altogether innocent of offences against the moral law,[4] in assisting him in the department of administration. In this position Gian Angelo had the mortifying experience of seeing his friends rise to distinguished positions in the Curia, his countryman, Girolamo Morone, having been created Cardinal in 1542, although he was ten years younger than himself. It was a hard, but a salutary school which the young Medici

---

[1] *Cf.* GIROL. SORANZO, 71; EHSES, Concil., IV., 332, n. 2, 350 n. 2. Gian Angelo in 1545 corresponded repeatedly with the legates of the Council; see MERKLE, I., 186, 189, 205, 224, 226.

[2] See ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 26. Concerning Tre Pievi see Bergmann in the treatise X., 172, n. 1, mentioned *infra*, p. 95, n. 1.

[3] *Cf.* GIROL. SORANZO, 171; BALAN, VI., 368; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 27.

[4] Gian Angelo had several illegitimate children before he received the major orders; a son, born either in 1541 or 1542, and two daughters; he had kept his failings secret and endeavoured to avoid public scandal (see MOCENIGO, 52, quoted in SORANZO, 95; *cf.* MÜLLER, 237). The question as to whether Gian Angelo de' Medici later on, as Cardinal and Pope, was

guilty of offences against morality, has not hitherto been examined. It can neither be affirmed with certainty nor denied. The statement of the by no means trustworthy Panvinius (*cf.* Appendix No. 37) in the third edition of his Vita Pii IV: "in voluptates pronus," is in too general a form, and the lampoons after the death of Pius IV. (F. Cattaneo sent several of the worst in his *reports of December 22 and 29, 1565, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua) naturally prove nothing for certain. Tiepolo (p. 181) lays stress, in his account of the causes of the death of Pius IV. (plainly drawn up with distaste) not only on his failings as to diet, but also "altri gravi disordini," which cannot be attributed with any certainty to offences against morality. A *report of Cusano of March 2, 1566, and which was hitherto unknown, states: "Papa Pio IV. haveva un medico da buon tempo per i consigli del quale vogliano si fusse dato alle cose venere[e], perch' egli con quanto sia di 65 anni vi attendeva. Hora S.S$^{\text{tà}}$ intendendo teneva donna havendo moglie l' ha fatto metter all' inquisitione prigione per adultero et si dubita la potrà far male essendo caduto nelli badi vi sono sopra. E perch' a questi dì fu spirato il confessor di Pio IV. et il Porcillega gran suo cam$^{\text{ro}}$ dicono come consapevoli delle cose veneree. Ho[ra] S.S$^{\text{tà}}$ fa far grandissima diligenza per trovar ch' è stato il malfattore per dargli il meritevole castigo" (Domestic, Court, and State Archives, Vienna). As nothing further is to be found in the State Archives at Vienna or elsewhere (in the *Avvisi di Roma of March 2, there is only some talk of the proceedings against those who had attacked the confessor of Pius IV. [Urb. 1040, p. 188b, Vatican Library]) there is nothing to check this communication of Cusano, a thing which in such a matter is absolutely necessary. Perhaps the researches undertaken by the Bollandists in the voluminous Borromeo correspondence in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, may throw some light on this mysterious affair; the Archives of the Inquisition, before which the physician of Pius IV. had to justify himself, are unfortunately not accessible.

had to pass through, a school in which he gained a thorough knowledge of men and countries, and learned to show adaptability in all circumstances.[1]

After his brother's marriage had connected him with the family of the Pope, it was not fitting that Gian Angelo should remain in his hitherto modest position, and he was appointed Archbishop of Ragusa on December 14th, 1545, in which diocese he was represented by a vicar. It is certain that he now received the major orders for the first time; he was consecrated bishop in St. Peter's on April 26th, 1546.[2] At this time his appointment as nuncio at Vienna seemed certain,[3] but just at that moment the great crisis in Germany occurred, and Charles V., resolved on war against the Schmalkaldic League, allied himself with Paul III. on June 26th, 1546. The Pope's nephew, Alessandro Farnese, was appointed Legate, and his brother Ottavio commander-in-chief of the Papal auxiliary forces,[4] the Archbishop of Ragusa accompanying them as Commissary General.[5] The future Pope, Pius IV. was thus made acquainted with conditions in the country where the great schism in the Church had taken its origin, his field of vision being thereby substantially extended. At the seat of war he met his brother Gian Giacomo who, as colonel in chief of the infantry, was attached to the head-quarters of the Emperor. When Alessandro Farnese returned to Rome he was accompanied by Gian Angelo, and a brief of July 23rd, 1547, decreed his appointment as Vice-Legate in Bologna,[1] where his friend Morone held the post of Legate. In September of the same year Medici had to hurry from Bologna to Parma, on receipt of the news of the murder of Pier Luigi Farnese, and it was mainly due to the energetic measures adopted by him that the city was saved for the Farnese.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 23.

[2] See the Acta consist, in MERKLE, I., 630; ŠUSTA, *loc. cit.*, 27. When Medici was Archbishop of Ragusa the *Dialogus de vita ac clericorum moribus auctore Marco Antonio Sacco Cremonense flamine, was dedicated to him. In this he is called "ecclesiastici decus ordinis praesulumque gemma," and overwhelmed with flattery (Cod. Vat., 5679, Vatican Library).

[3] *Cf.* the Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, VIII., 582-3.

[4] *Cf.* Vol. XII. of this work, p. 291 *seq.*

[5] See the Diary of Viglius van Zwichem concerning the Schmalkaldic War on the Danube, published by DRUFFEL, p. 264, Munich, 1877. Numerous reports from Gian Angelo are made use of in the Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, IX., 175, 185, 187, 189, 195, 198, 201, 205, 219, 251, 259, 268, 269, 280, 283, 304, 311, 326.

Gian Angelo de' Medici was thus obliged to spend fifteen years in hard work of many kinds, before he was at last assured of the purple, which was only bestowed upon him when, on April 8th, 1549, Paul III. held his last creation of Cardinals.[3] Medici, who as Vice-Legate of Umbria, had been in Perugia since the autumn of 1548,[4] now repaired to Rome, where he received S. Pudenziana as his titular church. Among those who offered him their congratulations was the Duke of Florence, who invited the new Cardinal to adopt the coat of arms of his house.[5]

In the conclave held after the death of Paul III., Medici supported the Imperialist party, and had a decisive influence in the election of Julius III. The new Pope gave him his confidence and associated him with the preliminary work in connection with the reform of the conclave.[6] During the war concerning Parma in the summer of 1551, Medici remained as legate with the Papal army, his brother, Gian Giacomo, being in command of the Imperial troops. At the end of the year, the Cardinal legate seems to have been himself responsible for his recall from his troublesome post, but the

---

[1] See Šusta, Pius IV., 28. *Cf.* Merkle, I., 670.

[2] See Girol. Soranzo, 71; Merkle, I., 692. *Cf.* Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, X., 114, 190.

[3] *Cf.* Vol. XII. of this work, p. 443.

[4] See Šusta, *loc. cit.*, 29, n. 4. *Cf.* Vol. XI. of this work, p, 335, n. 4. The people of the Grisons had prevented his receiving the bishopric of Como in 1548. See Wyman, 25 *seq.*

[5] Girol. Soranzo, 67-8. *Cf.* Müller, 283.

[6] See Vol. XIII. of this work, pp. 41, 159. *Cf.* Šusta, Pius IV., 31, 36.

Emperor did not prove ungrateful, for Medici received the bishopric of Cassano in 1553, and three years later, that of Foligno.[1]

Medici was much respected among his colleagues on account of his intimate acquaintance with canon law; he was permanent Prefect of the Signatura Gratiae, with Cardinal Saraceni, while he often represented Cardinal Puteo in the Signatura Justitiae. His principal work, however, was not done in the Curia, public opinion placing him among the Cardinals of lesser importance, while the people persisted in calling him "Medichino" as if the celebrated name of Medici was not suitable to him.[2] The Cardinal had his residence in the Fieschi palace, while he possessed a Vigna outside the Porta S. Pancrazio.[3] In both of these he enjoyed seeing himself surrounded by men of letters. In politics, he was, as before, an adherent of the Emperor, from whom he enjoyed a pension;[4] he never, however, took any prominent place in the party, and associated in a very friendly manner with those on the side of France. It was as little to his liking to bind himself to either side, as to take a prominent or important part in any struggle. He liked to keep on good terms with everyone, and the quiet times of Julius III. were very much to his taste.[5] The stormy reign of Paul IV. was, therefore, all the more painful to him, as he had contributed towards his election, as well as to that of Marcellus II.[6]

---

[1] See Vol. XIII. of this work, p. 132. ŠUSTA, 32-5. A number of letters from Medici to Ferrante Gonzaga about the war with Parma are in CAMPORI, CIII. Lettere inedite di sommi pontefici, 16 *seqq.* Modena, 1878.

[2] *Cf.* MÜLLER, 234 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, 35. Šusta forms a fair opinion concerning the actual circumstances. The anecdote concerning the prediction of the pontificate by young Silvio Antoniano (N. ERYTHRAEUS, Pinacotheca, 37; *cf.* CANCELLIERI, Possessi, 109) with which RANKE (Päpste, I⁶., 205) begins his account of the pontificate, is likely to lead the reader astray.

[3] *Cf.* Vol. XIII. of this work, p. 381, and ŠUSTA, 38.

[4] See the Venetian Despatches, II., 432.

[5] *Cf.* MOCENIGO, 51, and especially ŠUSTA, 39.

[6] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, pp. 10, 62.

From an ecclesiastical, as well as from a political point of view, the Carafa Pope belonged to an entirely different school of thought from that of Medici. Although the latter had repeatedly taken part in the reform conferences under Julius III. and Marcellus II.,[1] he was, nevertheless, as an old curialist of the days of the second Medici Pope, little affected by that mighty current which, under Paul IV., that inconsiderate zealot for the revival of the Church and powerful foe of the heretics, swept all before it. Paul IV. on that account, made use of him principally in legal matters.[2] The difference between them was still more striking with regard to their political views, and the fiery, imaginative Neapolitan formed an irreconcilable antithesis to the calm and sober Lombard.

This appeared when the political horizon grew cloudy.[3] It is to the credit of Medici that he did not conceal his opinion, and pronounced courageously and decisively against the war with the world-wide power of Spain.[4] The Cardinal was, however, obliged to leave Rome before hostilities broke out, for his brother, Gian Giacomo, who, in the struggle against Siena had lately given as great proofs[5] of his skill in war as of his shocking cruelty and self-seeking, had suddenly died. The Cardinal, as head of the family, returned to Milan at the beginning of December to see to the inheritance, which duty, combined with an attack of gout, kept him there till the spring of 1556.[1] He was back again in Rome in April, where he found himself, as an opponent of the war party, in a painful and, at last, in a dangerous position.[2] On the other hand, his importance was a good deal increased by this, as his friend, the Duke of Florence, did not fail to give prominence, at the court of Brussels, to the services which Cardinal Medici had rendered by his opposition to the war.[3] Medici's relations with Paul IV. which had been tolerably friendly[4] at the beginning of his pontificate, had now, owing to this attitude, become exactly the reverse, and this was not altered after the Peace of Cave. The fact that events had proved that his words of warning had been justified, did not improve the temper of the self-assured Carafa. The strict government of the impetuously reforming Pope, which, after the close of the war, became painfully evident in its harsh severity, disgusted the less strict members of the Curia with their life in Rome, and Medici, like many others, left the Eternal City in 1558. The voluntary exile which he thus took upon himself was not, however, the consequence of any open breach with Paul IV., whose nephew, Carlo Carafa, honoured the Cardinal by a visit in April; it was rather a period of leave, which Medici asked for in due form in order to undertake a cure for his gout at the baths of Lucca, and this Paul IV. graciously accorded to him together with a grant of 1000 ducats. This gout trouble, for which the damp climate of Rome was most unsuitable, was no mere fiction, although there were several other reasons which induced the Cardinal to leave the Curia. The strict regime in the city, his family affairs, and above all, certain ambitious plans which he wished to discuss in person with his patron, Cosimo I., all influenced him in coming to this decision.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* Vols. XIII, p. 159, XIV., p. 41, of this work.

[2] *Cf.* MÜLLER, 235 *seq.* Medici had been a member of the Inquisition since autumn, 1556 (see PASTOR, Dekrete, 20). Concerning his forebodings with regard to the policy of Paul IV. see Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 185.

[3] The two *briefs, to Ioannes Iacobus marchio Marignani, of August 20, 1555, and to Cosimo I., of August 22, 1555, testify to friendly relations. The Cardinal is accredited in the latter, and in the former he is even praised. Among other things, we read: "Cum idem tuus frater propediem Anconam profecturus ad te istuc omnino divertere cogitaret, has ei litteras dedimus, ut eae una cum ipso te nostris verbis salutarent et quasi testes essent tum multorum erga te apud nos officiorum quae is vere fraterna tuaque virtute ac te digna semper praestitit, tum nostrae perpetuae in eum benevolentiae." (Arm. 44, t. 4, n. 216, Papal Secret Archives).

[4] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 104.

[5] *Cf.* REUMONT, Toskana I., 199 *seq.* The magnificent suit of armour of Gian Giacomo is at present in the Castle at Erbach in Odenwald.

---

[1] *Cf.* SYLVAIN, I., 31; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 47. Besides the *letters of the Cardinal to C. Carafa and Morone in the *Cod. Barb., LXI., 7 (formerly 5698) and *Vat 6407 (Vatican Library) cited by Šusta, we also find in the Archives of the Count Waldburg of Hohenems a series of *original letters from Cardinal Medici to the Hohenems family, which are not wholly restricted to family matters, e.g. the *letters of January 14, 24, and 25, and March 4, 1556.

[2] On August 28, 1556, the Cardinal made his will. In this he recommends his soul to God, asserts his Catholic faith, in which he wishes to die, and desires to be buried without pomp; if his death takes place in Rome, he wishes to be buried in S. Pietro in Montorio, if in Milan, in the Ospedale Maggiore. This hospital is named as his residuary legatee. Then follow legacies for his brother Agostino (the Castle of Melegnano and its contents), for the Altemps, Borromei, Serbelloni, his sister Chiara, etc. An addition in his own hand is dated September 14, 1556. I owe my knowledge of this will to the Prefect of the Vatican, Mgr. Ratti. [Now his Holiness Pope Pius XI. Ed.]

[3] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 48, 58, 62. Concerning Medici's opposition *cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 136.

[4] See ŠUSTA, 47.

When Medici left Rome on June 13th, 1558, he first repaired to his episcopal see of Foligno,[2] and in the middle of July he proceeded to Florence. The consultations with Cosimo I. concerned the next conclave. It was only now, when his unruly and adventurous brother was dead, that the Duke of Florence could look upon Cardinal Medici as a suitable candidate for the tiara.[3] Previously Cosimo had only entertained a platonic friendship for Medici, and had curbed his ambition, but with the death of Gian Giacomo things had completely changed. In 1556 Cosimo seriously took up the Cardinal as a candidate for the Papacy, in the hope of finding in him a willing tool for the attainment of his ambitious plan of being created King of Tuscany.[1] All details were discussed at their meeting in July, 1558, in the very probable event of Paul IV., who was far advanced in age, soon closing his eyes in death. This probability seemed very near its realization when, at the end of August, the Carafa Pope was attacked by a very severe illness.[2] Medici, who was then at the baths of Lucca, heard, as excitedly as his patron, the news from Rome, which, however, soon announced that the iron constitution of the Pope had again surmounted the crisis. Only now did Medici, who had hitherto remained in the neighbourhood of Florence, betake himself to Milan. In a letter to the Duke of Florence at the beginning of October, he laid stress on the fact that all his hopes for the future were in the hands of His Highness.[3] His expectations were not to be disappointed.

---

[1] The false and prejudiced statements which Panvinius makes in the 3rd edition of his Vita Pii IV. (*cf.* Appendix No. 37) have been for the first time corrected by Šusta (Pius IV., 63 *seq.*).

[2] He *writes from there on June 19, 1558, to Annibale di Ems, that he intends for reasons of health to go to Bagni di Lucca (Hohenems Arch).

[3] People used therefore to say that Gian Giacomo had procured the Cardinal's hat for his brother by his marriage, and by his death the tiara. GIROL. SORANZO, 71.

While Cosimo was making his preparations for the next conclave, Cardinal Medici remained, from October 18th, 1558, till the death of Paul IV., partly in his native city of Milan, and partly on the beautiful shores of the Lake of Como. In Milan he was occupied with the completion of the palace commenced by his brother, while he also distributed alms with great generosity from the rich inheritance of Gian Giacomo.[4] His works of charity had also won the hearts of many in Rome, where he was known as the "Father of the poor"[5]

---

[1] *Cf.* Šusta, Pius IV., 64 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 222.

[3] *Cf.* Šusta, 67-9.

[4] *Cf.* Šusta, 95-9; here we find for the first time a correct account of the efforts of Medici to obtain the archbishopric of Milan, a matter that had not yet been settled at the death of Paul IV. Concerning the Cardinal's change of residence, see his letters in the Hohenems Archives (Jan. 16, 1559, from Como, and Feb. 8, and March 22, from Frascarolo).

[5] See Panvinius, Vita Pii IV. (first edition, enlarged in the second, *cf.* Appendix No. 37). Gian Angelo de' Medici also showed his care for the poor when Pope in so many ways that it was intended to have a commemorative medal struck (Venuti,

It can easily be understood that the Roman populace should have eagerly greeted the elevation of such a man to the throne of St. Peter, and great was the jubilation when the new Pope announced that he would secure peace, justice, and an ample supply of provisions to the Eternal City, which promise he confirmed by reducing the price of grain as early as the end of December, at the expense of the Exchequer. The state of opposition in which Cardinal Medici had stood towards Paul IV., and the moderate and sober attitude which he had always adopted, gave promise of a peaceful pontificate which would heal the wounds inflicted by the war and the exaggerated severity of the late Pope. The diplomatists themselves were convinced of this, and as neither party had triumphed in the elevation of Medici, while neither of them had suffered a complete defeat, the representatives of the rival powers were, without exception, satisfied.[1]

Although the new Pope was already over sixty, he was possessed of so much vigour that a long reign might be hoped

---

115; BONANNI, I., 277). *Cf.* Constit. archiconfrat. S. Hieronymi de urbe, 31, Rome, 1694; ARMELLINI, 75 *seq.*; Mitteilungen des Osterr. Instit., XIV., 577; LANCIANI, III., 211. The attempt to put a stop to the scandal of the beggars by the establishment of a poor-house was, however, not successful (*cf.* BONANNI, I., 285; LANCIANI, Golden Days, 99). Concerning the orphanage erected by Pius IV. near SS. Quattro Coronati, see *Le cose meravigliose*, 28. As to the care of the Pope for the Roman hospitals, *cf.* FORCELLA, VI., 404, 520; XI., 128. Nor did Pius IV. forget the poor prisoners (see Constit. archiconfraternitat. S. Hieronymi, 9).

[1] See DEMBIŃSKI, Wybór Piusa IV., 289. *Cf.* Ricasoli's *report of Dec. 26, 1559, in the State Archives, Florence and that of the Portuguese ambassador of December 30, 1559, in the Corpo dipl. Portug. VIII., 281; Canisii Epist., III., 567 *seq.* In the *Avviso di Roma of December 30, 1559, we read: "S'ha speranza ch' el sarà Pio di fatti come ha assunto il nome. Ha detto di voler pace, giustitia et abondantia" (Urb 1039, p. 112, Vatican Library). Concerning the joy of the Emperor, see the Venetian Dispatches, III., 131, 133.

for.[1] He was of middle height, and had a very healthy colour, while his friendly and cheerful countenance showed no trace of the severe gravity and unapproachable haughtiness of his predecessor. His nose was slightly aquiline, his forehead was high, and his short beard was tinged with grey, while his brilliant grey-blue eyes told of a sanguine temperament, which was clearly shown in his vivacious, impetuous, and often precipitate utterances,[2] as well as in his almost incredible activity. The impatience with which, in spite of all his geniality and kindness, he listened to the explanations of others, constantly interrupting them with remarks, was very characteristic of him. He himself used often to speak for an hour at a time, having a very good opinion of his own abilities, which would endure no difference of opinion.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* *Avviso di Roma of June 20, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 176b, Vatican Library). Concerning the appearance of Pius IV., and his character, *cf.* MOCENIGO, 61 *seq.;* GIROL. SORANZO, 120 *seq.* See also Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 341, and PANVINIUS, Vita Pii IV. (last edition; *cf.* Appendix No. 37). Of more recent writers see MÜLLER, 234 *seqq.*, 242; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 36 *seqq.;* Kurie I., xxx *seq.* The life size oil painting of Pius IV. which is in the possession of the Ambrosiana, is reproduced in San Carlo, 34. Another good portrait, which comes from Hohenems, is in the Castle of Frischenberg, at Bistrau, in Bohemia. The magnificent copper plate engraving (with bust to the right by Ant. Lafreri (*cf.* HARTIG in the Hist. Jahrbuch, XXXVIII, 299) can probably be traced back to a picture of the same period. The copper plate engravings by H. Cock and F. van Hülsen (both busts to the right, the former with tiara) as well as those of Nic v. Aelst and A. Loemans (both half-length figures turned to the right), of which there are excellent examples in the Kaiserl. Familien-Fideikommiss Library at Vienna, are good portraits of the Pope. The beautiful medal by the Milanese, G. A. Rossi, is well reproduced in MÜNTZ, III, 242, and that of L. Leone, belonging to the first years of the pontificate, in PLON, Leoni, Pl. 33, No. 5; *cf.* p. 268. The bust of Pius IV. is an excellent piece of work. Tomb in S. Maria degli Angeli in Rome. Concerning the statue of Pius IV. in the Cathedral at Milan, the work of Angelo de Marinis, see CALVI, Fam. Milan., Pl. 15; ESCHER, 176; illustrated also in RICCI, Kunst in Oberitalien, 198.

[2] Examples in PALLAVICINI, 17, 3, 7; 17, 8, 8, and SICKEL, Konzil, 355.

As Pius IV. was inclined to corpulency, he attached great importance to regular and vigorous exercise, beginning and ending his day's work with a long walk. None of the Popes has been such a great walker as he was, and he was, moreover, no friend of stiff ceremonial, but was often to be met almost unattended in the streets of Rome, either on foot or on horseback. All remonstrances on the score of his dignity or his age he ignored, saying "exercise maintains good health and keeps away illness, and I do not wish to die in bed." If he was attacked by fever one day, the next would find him, contrary to the orders of the doctors, again taking his usual walk.[2]

Pius IV. enjoyed living in the palace of San Marco, or in the magnificent apartments of the Castle of St. Angelo, especially during the first years of his reign.[3] In the July, and again in the August of 1560,[4] he visited the Palazzo Fieschi, in which he had resided as Cardinal, accompanied by Cardinals, ambassadors and numerous nobles. He went up and down stairs, inspecting all the apartments, and at last ascending to the tower of the palace, and all the time conversing in the most lively manner with those who accompanied him, and showing such activity that everyone was amazed. When he was congratulated on his vigour, shortly after his recovery from an illness, he remarked: "No, no. We do not wish to die so soon." He was particularly pleased by a remark of the

---

[1] See Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 341. That the Pope constantly interrupted the ambassadors is clear from the *report of the *Obedientia* envoys of their first audience, dated Narni, October 11, 1560 (State Library, Vienna). The dramatic *report of Mula (see Appendix No. 3) of September 24, 1560 (Papal Secret Archives) is also characteristic of this trait of Pius IV.

[2] See GIROL. SORANZO, 72-3.

[3] *Cf.* BONDONUS, 535; *Avviso di Roma of May 4, 1560 (Urb. 1039, Vatican Library).

[4] See *Avviso di Roma of July 10, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 188, Vatican Library).

Venetian ambassador, Mula, who said that there were senators in Venice who were twenty years older than His Holiness, yet who directed the affairs of State with as great skill as wisdom. The Pope himself reminded people that his predecessors had been twenty years older than he.[1]

On September 25th, 1560, Pius IV. left the palace of San Marco at an early hour, and proceeded, accompanied by eleven Cardinals and the Imperial, Portuguese and Venetian ambassadors, to S. Andrea, outside the Porta del Popolo, where he heard mass. The adjoining Villa Giulia was then visited, and the Pope walked about in the burning sun, without a stick, in animated conversation with the Cardinals, full of interest in the magnificent fountains and antique statues of the Villa, and quoting verses from the Latin poets. The Pope invited five Cardinals and the three ambassadors to dine with him, and conversed with them, principally on the subject of the antiquities of Rome. After dinner the conversation took a more serious turn, and dealt with current ecclesiastical and political affairs, and lasting so long that Cardinal Cueva, who was suffering from gout, had to ask permission to retire. At last the Pope also had a siesta, and then, partly on foot and partly on horseback, he visited the hilly part of the Villa, returning to the Vatican by the Ponte Molle. When they arrived there it was already night, but early the next morning, he was again going about the Vatican, inspecting the building operations which he had ordered.[2]

In the following year the activity of Pius IV. again aroused general astonishment, and the Mantuan agent, Francesco Tonina, reported on March 29th, 1561, that the Pope had ascended the cupola of St. Peter's and walked round it, a feat, says Tonina, which a man of twenty might have hesitated at. This man of sixty-two was, however, so little fatigued by it, that he returned again on the same day to the new building of the basilica, in which he took the greatest interest.[1] Taking the same lively interest in all the new edifices he was having built in Rome, he appeared now here and now there.[2] The reports of the Mantuan ambassador constantly tell in the years 1561 and 1562 how vigorous, energetic and cheerful the Pope was.[3] He used to walk so quickly that, as Girolamo Soranzo relates, in the year 1563, he tired everyone out, no matter how young they might be. When he was inspecting the work at the Palazzo Colonna in August, 1564, this man of sixty-five even climbed the unsteady scaffolding, without the least fear of falling stones.[4]

---

[1] See the **report of Mula of August 10, 1560 (State Library, Vienna). *Cf.* Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 351.

[2] *Cf.* the **Letter of Mula of September 26, 1560 (State Library, Vienna).

Gout and catarrh were the only illnesses which troubled Pius IV., and when he was not suffering from these, he almost always got up before daybreak. As soon as he was dressed he went for a long walk, during which he read his breviary.[5] During the next two or three hours, the most important business was transacted, and then he received the ambassadors. After these duties were over, the Pope heard mass, and then, if there was time before dinner, His Holiness granted audiences to the Cardinals and other persons. He was by no means disinclined for the pleasures of the table,[6] although his repasts were in no way as splendid as those of his predecessor, who had thought it necessary to display the magnificent side of the Papacy in this as in other ways.[1] The dishes which appeared at the table of Pius IV. were mostly plain and simple, and the service was performed by simple grooms of the chamber. The official banquets were also simple, the Pope wishing in this to set an example for the Cardinals and prelates. The Lombard could be recognised in his fondness for heavy dishes, especially puddings and pastry, prepared as in his native city, and of these Pius IV. partook more freely than was good for his health. It was only in 1563, after a long illness, that he gave up heavy dishes and wine, a thing which proved very beneficial to his health. After dinner he enjoyed a long siesta and then recited the remainder of his breviary, and received one or more of the Cardinals and ambassadors. A long walk in the Belvedere, which lasted till darkness fell in the winter, but in the summer was prolonged until supper time, brought his day to a close.[2]

---

[1] See last Chapter, Vol. XVI, of this work, the *report of Fr. Tonina, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. *Cf.* also the *report of Tonina of December 3, 1561, in App. No. 19.

[2] The Florentine ambassadors *report on August 2, 1561, that the Pope walks too much, so that his nephews fear for his health. (State Arch., Florence).

[3] See the *reports of Fr. Tonina of July 23 and 27, and August 2, 1561, March 4 and 18, April 2, May 18, and October 31, 1562 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[4] See in Appendix No. 36 the *report of Fr. Tonina of August 12, 1564 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[5] "Quella mattina," *reports Serristori on June 20, 1561, "sul spuntar del sole trovai S.S. diceva l'offitio nel suo giardino di Monte Cavallo." (State Archives, Florence).

[6] Pius IV. ate five times a day; see the *report of Fr. Tonina of July 2, 1562 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). After his illness in December, 1563, his appetite failed; see the *report of Serristori, of December 17, 1563. (State Archives, Florence).

Paul IV. had always invited none but Cardinals and great prelates to his table, but such dignitaries were only occasionally to be seen at that of Pius IV. His simple and hearty manners were reflected in the free and unrestrained intercourse of his table. He was very fond of inviting intellectual and witty men of letters, but he did not disdain to amuse himself with the jokes of the court jesters.[3] The Pope himself had a good knowledge of literature, and had always been interested in the works of poets and historians. When he gathered around him the most celebrated of the humanists of the time he was fond of showing off his excellent memory by quoting whole pages from the old writers. When conversing with the ambassadors Pius IV. also liked sometimes to introduce a verse from Horace, or to cite examples from history.[1] According to the learned opinion of Girolamo Soranzo the Pope knew Latin so well that he expressed himself in it at the consistories with the greatest fluency and pertinency. His handwriting was also as clear and decided as his style,[2] although he committed little more than business communications and legal documents to paper, and his knowledge of canon law was as wide as it was profound, while he was intimately acquainted with everything connected with finance and the conduct of affairs. Although he was a master in his understanding of the business of the Curia as a jurist and administrator, he had little deep theological knowledge. He was perfectly well aware of this himself, and left all knotty points in this matter for solution by experts.[3] The reproaches levelled against him when he was a Cardinal in the conclave, concerning his remark with regard to the concessions to be granted to the Germans in the matters of communion under both kinds, and the marriage of priests,[4] must be attributed to the want on his part of a thorough theological training. Pius IV. himself referred openly to his want of theological knowledge, and especially when he had promised more than he could perform. This frequently happened, because, kind-hearted as he was, he found it very hard to refuse requests,[5] and in difficult cases he

---

[1] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, pp. 66, 68.

[2] *Cf.* GIROL. SORANZO, 73, 77-8; GIAC. SORANZO, 129. Concerning the "pasto modesto" for the *obedientia* envoys, see ALBÈRI, II., 4, 15.

[3] See GIROL. SORANZO, 77. Concerning the court jester, Moretto, see the *reports of Tonina of January 4 and 8, 1561. In the first he says: "Principalmente N.S. il primo dell' anno, con tutto che sentisse poco de podagra, diede la magnare la mattina alli parenti, e perchè il Moretto buffone disse e fece molte cose a quel desinare, che lo fecero smascellare di risa, gli donò cento scudi d'oro, et il s. duca d'Urbino gli ne donò cinquanta, et il card^{le} suo fratello 30" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The banquet in honour of Cosimo I., during which Pius IV. joked

---

extravagantly with two dwarfs and a favourite of Leo X., "cantò certi versi elegi latini sonando poi con la lira," is described by Tonina in his *report of November 27, 1560.

[1] Examples in Mula's *reports of September 24 and October 26, 1560 (State Library, Vienna).

[2] See GIROL. SORANZO, 74; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 38.

[3] GIROL. SORANZO, 74; GIAC. SORANZO, 129-30.

[4] *Cf. supra* p. 33.

[5] ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 39.

preferred to take a middle course. His talent was particularly shown in the smoothing over and adjustment of conflicting interests, and this he was very fond of doing,[1] and therefore hated nothing so much as harsh and inconsiderate action. His sense of statesmanship, and his grasp of practical questions and the needs of the moment were very remarkable. These qualities, as well as the absolute independence of his decisions, first came to light, it is true, after his elevation to the throne of St. Peter. Only then was it understood that the simple and shrewd Lombard possessed, if not a very outstanding, at least a thoroughly independent personality, and that he had made most excellent use of the manifold experience and knowledge of different countries which he had acquired during his long years of hard and practical work.[2] Full of worldly wisdom, he had above all learned from the bitter experience of his predecessor that the respect due to the Holy See could not be maintained under strained relations with the Catholic princes, and that a moderate and cautious policy should be followed. This knowledge restrained his impulsive nature,[3] and as early as December 26th, 1559, we find Pius IV. saying to the ambassadors of Cosimo I. that he wished to be on good terms with all the Catholic princes, and to preserve peace.[4]

The ambassadors were better able to understand the gifts of statesmanship of the new Pope, his clear grasp of the realities of practical political life, and his delicate tact, as his intercourse with them grew more unrestrained. Here again the difference between him and Paul IV. showed itself in a marked degree, for it was now as easy to penetrate into the presence of Pius IV., as it had been in recent times difficult to obtain an audience with the head of the Church.[1] None of the strict Spanish haughtiness of the Carafa Pope was now to be seen; Pius IV. was simple, kind, and affable to everyone, and especially with the ambassadors he laid all ceremony aside.[2] It was especially the representatives of Cosimo I. and the Venetian Republic who were able to approach him at all times, and to whom he showed the greatest favour, and they repeatedly relate how the Pope, when about to take his walk in the Belvedere, would summon them quite unceremoniously to join him, while after their return they would accompany him to his private apartments.[3] The kindness and condescension of His Holiness was so great, that he excused himself if, in consequence of pressing business, the ambassadors had to wait for a time.[4] He liked to express his opinion in the most detailed way to the Venetian ambassadors, Marcantonio da Mula[5] and Girolamo Soranzo, of whom he was particularly fond. Soranzo writes that his audiences seldom lasted less than an hour, and that the confidence which the Pope then showed him could not have been greater, while Pius IV. himself repeatedly remarked that he told the ambassadors what he had been thinking over during the night.[6]

---

[1] His attitude to the Carafa after their fall is characteristic of this. *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 227, n. 1.

[2] *Cf.* Šusta, Kurie, I., xxx, and Pius IV., 36 *seq.* In the latter place it is excellently shown how false was the opinion of the superficial or hostile observer who only saw in Cardinal Medici a good and simple man, well versed in law, but without any great power of imagination, who pretended to be indifferent, in order the more surely to attain to the supreme dignity.

[3] *Cf.* Hilliger, 4.

[4] See the *report of G. B. Ricasoli of December 26, 1559 (State Arch., Florence).

---

[1] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 210.

[2] See MOCENIGO, 51; GIROL. SORANZO, 75; *report of the Bolognese ambassador of T. Cospi, of July 24, 1560 (State Archives, Bologna).

[3] *Cf.* the *report of Ricasoli of June 1, 1560, and those of Saraceni of April 23 and June 20, 1561 (State Archives, Florence) and the *reports of Mula of November 9 and 16, 1560 (State Library, Vienna).

[4] So *reports Mula on June 15, 1560: "Serenissimo Principe. Andai a S.S^{ta} hieri mattina . . . et ella si scusò d'havermi fatto aspettare." (State Library, Vienna). *Cf.* Appendix No. 3.

[5] *Cf.* especially the *reports of Mula for the years 1560-1 quoted (State Library, Vienna), *infra* cap. IV. See specially *report of 6 September, 1560.

[6] GIAC. SORANZO, 131.

Pius IV. very clearly showed the great value he attached to his relations with Venice at the first appearance of the *obedientia* envoys of the Republic,[1] who were literally overwhelmed with attentions. This ceremony took place on May 13th in the principal hall of the palace of San Marco, an honour which hitherto had not been conferred on the representatives of Venice. The Pope replied to Mula's address himself, repeatedly referring to the Republic by the title of "Serenissima," and during the private audience granted two days later to the Venetian ambassadors the Pope insisted on their being seated and remaining covered. On this occasion he praised the services of Venice as the defender of Christendom and the Holy See. He spoke so emphatically that the astonished ambassador wrote home: "This Pope will, if we do our part, always be on the side of Venice." At the same audience the Pope expressed himself, in the most confidential manner and in great detail, regarding the attitude which he intended taking up with respect to religious and political matters. In so doing, he insisted how ardently he desired to live in peace with all Christian princes, especially those in Italy, and to work for the well-being of the Church, adding that he intended again to summon the Council to Trent, and to maintain the unity of the faith in Italy. The ambassadors, who were treated with the greatest distinction during their stay in Rome, once more received similar assurances at their farewell audience on May 20th, 1560. Pius IV. declared that he would defend the rights of the Church and the Holy See against all encroachments, but in other matters he would not fail to make friendly advances in so far as such were possible.[2] These peaceful sentiments on the part of the Pope, as well as his intention of reforming the Church and continuing the Council, are emphasized by the Venetian ambassador, Luigi Mocenigo, in his final report of his embassy, in which he was replaced in 1560 by Marcantonio da Mula. He was of opinion that only two things gave cause for misgiving: the Pope's intimate relations with Cosimo I. and the great number of his nephews.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* the report of Melch. Michiel of June 8, 1560, in ALBÈRI, II., 4, 4 *seq.*, 7 *seq.*

[2] See M. Michiel, *loc. cit.*, 9 *seq.*, 13 *seq.*, 16 *seq.* *Cf.* also Mula's *report of May 22, 1560 (State Library, Vienna). Concerning the *obedientia* of the Venetians, *cf.* BONDONUS, 534.

---

[1] See Mocenigo, 51. *Cf.* P. Pacheco in HILLIGER, 7.

CHAPTER III

THE POPE'S RELATIVES. CHARLES BORROMEO. DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH THE PRINCES.

IT is indeed a fact that few Popes have been so richly blessed with relations as Pius IV., and many of these received so great signs of affection that a new reign of nepotism might well be feared. The Medici from Milan gave the least cause for anxiety; Gian Giacomo died childless, and of the other brothers of the Pope there only remained Agosto. The disputes with this sarcastic man over the inheritance had been embittered yet more by his intriguing wife, whose reputation was none of the best, and the relations between the Pope and his brother since then had not been of a friendly nature. At the beginning of the pontificate Agosto was not even allowed to come to Rome, but when this permission was accorded to him in 1562, principally through the intercession of Cosimo I., he received indeed a monthly allowance of 200 scudi, but not, as he had expected, any influential office, for which, in any case, he would not have been suited.[1]

The three youngest of the five sisters of Pius IV. had been for years in a convent in Lombardy,[2] while the two others were married: Margherita to Gilberto Borromeo, Count of Arona,[3] and Chiara to Wolf Dietrich von Hohenems.

The noble family of Ems had their seat in the Vorarlberg, in the Castle of Hohenems, which is situated on a steep rock near Götzis. They were a war-like race, many members of which, with their vassals, had fought on the bloody battlefields of Italy, such as Mark Sittich I. at the beginning of the XVIth century, and his still more famous cousin, Jakob von Ems, who, after a short but victorious career, fell before Ravenna on April 14th, 1512. Wolf Dietrich, the second son of Mark Sittich (born 1507, died 1538) also distinguished himself as a soldier in Italy.[1] By his marriage with Chiara de' Medici, he had three sons and two daughters: Jakob Hannibal, Mark Sittich II., Gabriel, Margaret, and Helena. Cardinal Medici took a very lively interest in the children of his sister. In the archives of Hohenems there is still preserved a letter in which he dissuades the latter from sending the young Gabriel, who has no inclination for the priesthood, to the dangerous metropolis of Rome.[2] When he was raised to the supreme pontificate Pius IV. allowed all three sons to come to his court, but he soon had cause to regret this weakness.

---

[1] *Cf.* MOCENIGO, 52; GIROL. SORANZO, 92 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, Pius IV., 96. Concerning the intercession of Cosimo I., see the interesting *report of Fr. Tonina of January 29, 1563. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[2] *Cf.* CALVI, Fam. Milan., III.

[3] Concerning the Count of Arona see WYMANN, 31 *seq.*, where the voluminous special literature has been made use of.

From the marriage of the Pope's elder sister with Gilberto Borromeo, there were two sons, Federigo and Carlo. Pius IV. distinguished these nephews to such a degree that the jealously of those of Ems broke out fiercely. Besides those already mentioned there were yet other Milanese relatives on his mother's side, the five sons of Gian Pietro Serbelloni, who were all struggling for honours and office. The ambassador of the Duke of Ferrara announces on January 17th, 1560, that the Pope has taken affairs in hand so energetically that hopes may be entertained of a better era, and that the number of his nephews who are flocking to Rome is constantly increasing; already eighteen or twenty have arrived. A week later the same ambassador says that the number of the Pope's relatives is still growing.[1] This is not, indeed, matter for surprise, for the prospects which opened before them were brilliant.

---

[1] See Bergmann, Die Edlen von Embs zu Hohenembs: Denkschrift der Wiener Akad., Phil-hist., Kl. X., 93 *seqq.* (1860) XI., 1 *seqq.* (1861). See also the records from 1315-1537 in the archives of the Hohenems family collected by F. Joller (Programm des Gymnasiums zu Feldkirch), Freiburg, 1860, as well as the treatise "Gli Hohenems cittadini Milanesi" (through Charles V., 1553) in the Bollett. stor. d. Svizz. Ital., XXVIII (1906), and Wymann, 27 *seqq.* *Cf.* also H. Wartmann, Der Hof Widnau-Haslach: St. Gallische Gemeindearchive, 1887, S. vii *seqq.*, in the introduction upon Mark Sittich I.

[2] In the characteristic *letter of the Cardinal from Rome of June 20, 1556, he says of Gabriel: " . . . il quale non havendo inclinatione di esser prete non puo disegnar di acquistar cosa alcuna in questa corte, non sia per molto meglio riuscirgli in ogn' altro luogo che stia d'Italia. Impero che questa è una citta piena di tanti sviamenti che insieme con l' imparar la lingua et lo scrivere Italiano impareria facilmente di quelle cose che parturirebbono dishonore a lui et a me." (Hohenems Archives).

Pius IV. showed the greatest favour to the sons of his sister Margherita, the two Counts Borromeo. The elder, Federigo, had already been present at the Pope's coronation, and soon afterwards the younger brother, Charles, also appeared,[2] at the express summons of the Pope.[3] It was a memorable day in the history of Rome and the Church when this youth of twenty-one made his entrance into the Eternal City. The elevation of his uncle to the throne of St. Peter could hardly have had a more happy result than that, at a single stroke, it opened the way on which he, in the course of a few years, was to become the most enlightened guide and the ablest promoter of the Catholic reformation.

---

[1] See the *letters of Giulio Grandi of January 7 and 24, 1560, in the State Archives, Modena. In the former he says: "*Li nipoti suoi ogni dì multiplicano da Milano et Germania." See also the *Avvisi di Roma of January 6 and 13, 1560. In that of the 13 we read: "Et tuttavia vengono delli parenti assai, liqual è da credere che vorano per loro se non il tutto, almanco la maggior parte al fermo." (Urb. 1039, Vatican Library).

[2] According to the *Avviso di Roma of January 6, 1560, Carlo Borromeo and Giov. Batt. Serbelloni were summoned to Rome by letter on the day after the election. (Urb. 1039, p. 14, Vatican Library).

[3] The Bishop of Verona, Cardinal Agostino Valiero, wrote the earliest biography of Charles Borromeo (Latin, Cologne, 1587, Italian, Milan, 1587); perhaps the best was that of the General of the Barnabites and Bishop of Navara, Bascapè (first pub. Ingoldstadt, 1592). Bascapè says himself (p. 2): "Eloquentiam historiaeque scribendae artem concedens multis, rerum ipsarum notitiam veritatemque iure mihi vendicare posse videor." On the same page he gives as his sources: personal acquaintance of many years with Charles Borromeo, information from his intimate friends, and countless documents, among which are some 30,000 letters from and to Charles. *Cf.* P. L. MANZINI in La Scuola catt., Ser. 4, Vol. XVIII., 330-7 (1910); Analecta

Immediately after the arrival of Charles, Pius IV. showed his affection for him so plainly that people said he loved him as the apple of his eye.[1] He at once invested him with the dignity of Protonotary and with various benefices.[2] It was at once rumoured in Milan as well as in Rome, that Charles, who was so highly esteemed by the Pope, would be raised to the purple,[3] and his reception into the Sacred College followed

---

Bolland., XXII., 121. The most wide-spread and interesting description of his life was that compiled for the feast of his canonization, GIUSSANO, Brescia, 1610. ARISTIDE SALA collected documents relating to C. Borromeo (three volumes, and Fascicolo conclusionale, Milan, 1857-62) as well as his Biografia (Milan, 1858) provided with "Dissertazioni e note." Much unpublished material is made use of by CHARLES SYLVAIN (Lille, 1884) and in the publication San Carlo Borromeo nel terzo centenario della canonizzazione, Milan, 1908-10. The Bollandists are preparing a new and comprehensive collection of documents relating to C. Borromeo. In particular, the documents of the Roman archives and of the Ambrosian Library in Milan, which P. v. Ortroy has collected during long years of devoted work, are to be published by them.

[1] It is said of the Pope, writes Ricasoli on January 12, 1560: "*Carlo esser l' ochio suo diretto." (State Archives, Florence).

[2] *Cf.* *Avviso di Roma of January 27, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 122b, Vatican Library).

[3] Besides SYLVAIN, I., 50 *seq.*, *cf.* the *Avviso di Roma of January 13, 1560, according to which the early elevation of Charles to the cardinalate was already spoken of (Urb. 1039, p. 117, Vatican Library). In the *letter of Giulio Grandi, dated Rome, January 17, 1560, it is stated: "Si ragiona che nel concistoro de venerdì proximo la S. Sua promoverà al cardinalato l' abate Bonromei [sic] suo nipote con darli il suo capello proprio. Questo giovane è molto amato dalla S^{ta} Sua et peramente dimostra nelle sue attioni esser assai meritevole." (State Arch. Modena).

very soon. On January 31st, 1560, Charles Borromeo, Gian Antonio Serbelloni, and Giovanni de' Medici, the seventeen-year-old son of Cosimo I., were created Cardinals.[1] Pius IV. soon showered further tokens of his love on Charles. On February 7th he received the administration of the archbishopric of Milan, and on April 25th the legation of Bologna.[2] Pius IV. had intended to give the direction of ecclesiastical and political affairs to Cardinal Morone, but the latter declined the honour.[3] Thereupon the Pope transferred to Charles Borromeo the administration of the Papal States, and installed his Cardinal-nephew at the head of the secretariate of state.[4] In the middle of March this appointment was announced to the nuncios, together with the order that in future all instructions given by the Cardinal Deacon of SS. Vito e Modesto,[5] for such was the first titular church of Charles, were to be regarded as coming from the Pope himself.[6]

Charles' only brother, Federigo, was also richly endowed with honours and dignities. This nephew, who was aged twenty-five, was to found the territorial power of the Borromei by means of a marriage with a member of a princely house.[1] The bride chosen for him, as was announced as early as the end of February, 1560, was Virginia della Rovere, the daughter of Duke Guidobaldo of Urbino.[2] A plan was made to bestow Camerino on him, as this was the inheritance of Virginia's mother, Guilia Varano, and it was once more to be taken from the Farnese family.[3] The betrothal contract was signed on May 5th in the apartments of Cardinal Borromeo. Four days later Federigo went to Pesaro for the wedding, from whence he was to proceed to Milan to be present at the marriage of his sister, Camilla, to Cesare Gonzaga of Guastalla, the eldest son of Ferrante.[4] On August 31st Cesare Gonzaga came to Rome, where the Pope received him very affectionately.[1] In October the wife of Federigo was expected in the Eternal City, and apartments were prepared for her in the Belvedere, which were so sumptuous that they might have served for a king.[2]

---

[1] See Acta consist. in RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 92; Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 341; BONDONUS, 532. GIACONIUS, III., 889 *seq.*, 896 *seq.*; *report of Ricasoli of January 31, 1560. (State Archives Florence).

[2] See Acta consist. *loc. cit.*; MASSARELLI, 344. The brief of appointment to Milan of February 23, 1560, in SALA, Fascicolo conclus., 12 *seqq.* A Motu Proprio of February 8, 1560, amplified in a brief of May 1, 1561, assures to the archbishop the free disposal of all the benefices accruing to him. SALA, Documenti, I., 119 *seq.*, 137 *seq.*

[3] See the *report of Gian. Batt. Ricasoli of January 8, 1560, State Archives, Florence (Medic., 3279).

[4] *Cf.* BASCAPÈ, 5 *seq.*; GUISSANO, 12; Panvinius in MERKLE, II., 593 *seq.*: "Carolum Boromeum [sic] iuris scientia praeditum, quem perhumanum, modestum et industrium virum negotiis omnibus ecclesiasticis tractandis praefecit."

[5] On September 4, 1560, Borromeo received S. Martino ai Monti as his titular church, which he exchanged for S. Prassede on November 17, 1564.

[6] See the brief of March 15, 1560, in RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 94.

---

[1] See Šusta, Kurie, I., xxxii. G. Grandi *reports on January 17, 1560, that Federigo Borromeo is to receive the "governo di Ancona," and then to be sent to Philip II. (State Archives, Modena); but on February 10, 1560, the marriage by which Camerino was to come into his hands was already being spoken of. See the *Avviso di Roma of February 10, 1560. (Urb. 1039, p. 127, Vatican Library).

[2] *Avviso di Roma of February 24, 1560. (Urb. 1039, p. 131, Vatican Library).

[3] An *Avviso di Roma of April 27, 1560, announces that the matter of Camerino has been handed over to the Rota; that of the 29 is to the effect that three Cardinals are to discuss the matter. (Urb. 1039, p. 151, 176, 218, Vatican Library). On November 23 (see the *Avviso of that date) the speedy settlement of the matter was expected; Pius IV. already spoke of the "duchessa di Camerino, nostra nipote," but prematurely. The question was not decided, in spite of the suit which had been begun. See Šusta, Kurie, II., 401, 423, 456, 458, 553; III., 429, 446.

[4] According to the *Avviso di Roma of April 27, 1560, Cardinal della Rovere left Rome on April 25 to bring the negotiations concerning the marriage to a close. After his return on May 5 the contract was concluded (*Avviso of May 11), whereupon Federigo left on May 9; (Urb. 1039, p. 151, 156). *Ibid.* 143 and *Avviso of March 30 concerning the marriage between C. Gonzaga and Camilla Borromeo, who received valuable presents from the Pope (Vatican Library).

The Duke of Urbino himself appeared in Rome on November 4th, before the arrival of Virginia, and two days later Cosimo I.[3] The stay of the latter prince in Rome, which was prolonged until December 28th, and the striking marks of honour paid to him by the Pope,[4] gave rise to all sorts of rumours. It was believed that the Duke had come to receive the title of "King of Tuscany," but such an elevation was opposed both by Philip II. and Ferdinand I.[5] and the diplomatists of the Hapsburgs in Rome were filled with all the greater misgivings as Cosimo's dealings with the Pope were kept very secret.[6] The most various rumours were current,[7] but at last events proved that Cosimo had completely deceived himself in believing that Pius IV. would subordinate himself to the carrying out of all his schemes.[1]

---

[1] *Avviso di Roma of August 31, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 194, Vatican Library). C. Gonzaga afterwards lived in the Palazzo San Marco.

[2] *Avviso di Roma of October 19, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 210b, Vatican Library).

[3] The arrival of both princes is described by Fr. Tonina in his *report of November 6 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua) and an *Avviso di Roma of November 9, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 214, Vatican Library). According to the latter the Duke of Urbino was lodged in the "stanze nuove del palazzo, che fece fare Julio III."; Cosimo I. and the Duchess "nelle stanze d' Innocenzo VIII. e di Sisto, restaurate di questo papa con molto ordine."

[4] *Cf.* Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 348; BONDONUS 585 *seq.*; REUMONT, Toskana, I., 230 *seq.*; PALANDRI, 98 *seq.*

[5] *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 83; VOSS, 95; Venetian Despatches, III., 159, 166. *Cf.* also LE BRET, Gesch. Italiens, VIII., 159 *seq.*; even before Cosimo I. appeared in Rome the most various conjectures were made as to the reason for his arrival; see the *report of Fr. Tonina of October 30, 1560 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[6] See Mula's *report of November 16, 1560 (State Library, Vienna).

[7] *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 91, 93, 96, 121, 133. See also the correspondence of Card. O. Truchsess, 229, 231 *seq.*

The Dukes of Urbino and Florence were still in Rome when, on December 7th, 1560, Virginia approached the city in gorgeous state. Four Cardinals and numerous prelates went to meet her at the Prima Porta, where she was also greeted by the Roman nobility, and at the Ponte Molle by the diplomatic corps. After Virginia had spent the night at the Villa Giulia, she made her entrance into the Eternal City on a white palfrey, her head covered with a coif gleaming with jewels, while an honour was rendered to the young Duchess which had hitherto been conferred only upon queens and empresses, for by her side rode two Cardinals, Rovere and Borromeo.[2]

Pius IV. made it his business that honours and riches should also fall to the lot of his remaining nephews, but he was not able to satisfy them to the full. The second of the five Serbelloni brothers had been received, as has been already stated, into the Sacred College at the same time as Carlo Borromeo. Gian Battista Serbelloni had received the office of the Captain of the Castle of St. Angelo, while his brother Gabrio had become Captain of the Papal guard.[3] Fabrizio Serbelloni was sent in October, 1561, to France, to defend the city of Avignon, which was being threatened by the Huguenots,[4]

---

[1] See HILLIGER, 7, 25.

[2] See BONDONUS, 537 *seq.* *Cf.* MASSARELLI, 349, and *report of Fr. Tonina of December 11, 1560 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Concerning the preparations for the reception of Virginia see *Avvisi di Roma of November 16 and 23, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 216, 218, Vatican Library).

[3] See the *report of G. Grandi of January 17, 1560 (State Archives, Modena). *Cf.* PAGLIUCCHI, 138. *Ibid.* 144, concerning the appointment of Gian Battista to the bishopric of Cassano, which took place on September 17, 1562. Gabrio and his brother Gian Battista had arrived in Rome on January 4 (*Avviso di Roma of January 6, 1560, Urb. 1039, p. 114, Vatican Library). Gabrio Serbelloni was later on entrusted with the superintendence of the fortresses of the States of the Church; Girol. Soranzo praises him (p. 94).

[4] See *Avviso di Roma of October 25, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 305, Vatican Library). *Cf.* GIROL SORANZO, 95.

Gabrio Serbelloni was most dissatisfied with his office, and jealousy filled his heart. He complained to the Florentine ambassador as early as June, 1560, that the Pope did not make independent decisions, but submitted everything to the judgment of Cardinal Borromeo,[1] and later on the same ambassador repeatedly heard bitter complaints from Gabrio, who thought himself quite put into the background.[2]

The family of Hohenems was likewise filled with bitter jealousy at the signs of favour which were lavished upon the Borromei. These warlike German petty nobles had hurried to Rome immediately after the election of Pius IV. in order to make their fortunes there as nephews of the Pope. They were dignified men, as Cardinal Truchsess informed Duke Albert of Bavaria, but the Italians laughed at them because of their want of culture and their rough and clumsy manners.[3] They were not, however, lacking in ambition, and were of the opinion that one of their number should also be invested with the purple.[4] Their aspirations rose yet higher when Ferdinand I. raised them to the rank of Counts of the Empire on April 27th, 1560.[5]

The jealousy of his nephews and their quarrels caused the

---

[1] *Letters in cypher from G. B. Ricasoli of June 1, 1560 (State Archives, Florence).

[2] See the *letters of G. B. Ricasoli of June 13 and 24, and July 8, 1560 (State Archives, Florence). In the *report of June 24, he says in cypher: "Gabrio si trova assai mal contento parendoli il Papa pensi a beneficare ogn' altro che lui."

[3] Truchsess on January 20, 1560, in Correspondence of Card. O. Truchsess, 128; HILLIGER, 10-11.

[4] When the Mark Sittich received a "commendam" of the order of St. James, an *Avviso di Roma of February 24, 1560, states that people saw in this the first step towards the cardinalate. That Hohenems endeavoured to attain to this is testified by the *Avviso di Roma of March 9, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 131, 135b., Vatican Library).

[5] See the diploma in BERGMANN, Die Edlen von Embs zu Hohenembs: Denkschrift der Wiener Akad., Phil-hist., Kl., X., 180 *seq.* (1860).

Pope many hours of anxiety from the beginning of his reign.[1] Cardinal Madruzzo of Trent interested himself in the German nephews to such an extent as to cause the Borromei considerable anxiety and displeasure.[2] In order to give the Hohenems family satisfaction and to put an end to their intrigues against the Borromei, Pius IV. determined to get them out of Rome by sending them on honourable missions.[3] Mark Sittich von Hohenems was, despite his very worldly inclinations, appointed Bishop of Cassano in 1560, and sent in the June of that year to the court of Ferdinand I., for which mission he was prepared by being first raised to the bishopric of Constance. On February 26th in the following year, Mark Sittich, although he was by no means fitted for it, received the dignity of

---

[1] An *Avviso di Roma of January 27, 1560, reports the jealousy which the beginnings of the special notice taken of the Borromei excited: "Il che vedendo l' altri nipoti di S.S. hanno cominciat' a murmurar' et havute strane parole tra loro, il che ha dato qualche travaglio a S.S., massime per quelli d'Alemagna ch' hanno il cervello alquanto gagliardo, et hormai sono comparsi tanti nipoti che passano il numero de 15." *Cf.* further the *Avvisi di Roma of February 3 and March 16, 1560 (the German nephews would in no way be under the Borromei, and said they wished their sisters to be placed just as high, "et così ogni dì ha S.S^{ta} qualche fastidio della competentia et emulutione, che è fra loro"), Urb. 1039, p. 122, 124, 138, Vatican Library. The continued discord between the nephews is dealt with in a *report in cypher of G. Grandi of March 13, 1560 (State Archives, Modena).

[2] See the report of Truchsess of March 16, 1560, in the Correspondence of Card. O. Truchsess, 150. *Cf.* HILLIGER, 10, who according to ŠUSTA, Kurie, I., xxii, overrates the rivalry. How long these disputes continued may be seen from the **report of Fr. Tonina of December 29, 1560 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] *Cf.* GIROL. SORANZO, 89 *seq.* According to an *Avviso di Roma of May 25, 1560, there was talk at that time of marrying Hannibal von Hohenems to Giovanna d'Aragona, and of buying a state for him in Italy. Salerno was mentioned, which was to cost 300,000 ducats (*cf.* *Avvisi di Roma of June 1 and 8 [settlement of marriage contract] and June 15). Urb. 1039, p. 160, 163, 165a, 179b, Vatican Library. *Cf.* MOCENIGO, 53.

Cardinal. In January, 1562, he was fixed upon as sixth legate for the Council of Trent.[1] In all these positions he proved his worth as little as did his brother, Jakob Hannibal, in his mission to the court of Philip II. of Spain.[2] Gabriel von Hohenems was distinguished by being sent on an expedition to France, while his sister Margaret was married to a nephew of Cardinal Madruzzo.[3]

Neither the Hohenems nor the Serbelloni attained to any great importance in Roman affairs in the years which followed, the whole of the Pope's affection being centred in the Borromei.

---

[1] *Cf.* Mocenigo, 53-4; Girol. Soranzo, 81; Sickel, Konzil, 47, 230 *seq.*; Steinherz, Nuntiaturberichte, I., 59, 60, 69, 71, 72, 74, 96, 100, 128, 266 *seq.*, 303 307, 312 323 *seq.*, 351, 373; Šusta, Kurie, I, 99 101, 109, 114, 120 *seq.*, 151, 163; II., vi *seq.*; especially Reinhardt-Steffens, G. Fr. Bonhomini, Einl. S. xlii *seq.* and Wymann, 66 *seqq.*, where there is also other literature. Mark Sittich was spoken of as a candidate for the purple in a letter of Cardinal Truchsess of May 18, 1560 (Correspondence, 166) and also in the *report of G. Grandi of September 12, 1560 (State Archives, Modena). The Altemps, Dukes of Gallese, trace their origin from Roberto, the natural son of Mark Sittich, afterwards legitimatized (see Bergmann, *loc. cit.*, XI., 6 *seq.*; *cf.* Litta, 91). With regard to the coat of arms of Cardinal Altemps see Archives Héraldiques Suisses, 199 *seqq.*, Zurich, 1913; *cf.* 1912, p. 153. A magnificent chimney piece, with a beautiful bust of Mark Sittich, came from the Palazzo Altemps to the Villa Malta, the Roman residence of that lover of the arts, Prince Bülow.

[2] As an amplification of the details in Šusta, Kurie, I., 317, 319, *cf.* the **letters of Pius IV., to Hannibal von Hohenems, dated Rome, January 22, March 5 (App. no. 15) and 31, May 5 and 21, 1561, which contain sharp reprimands of Hannibal's behaviour. However, when he showed sorrow the Pope forgave him, in a *letter of October 8, 1562. In a *letter of November 26, 1562, the Pope orders him to remain in Spain for the present. All these letters are to be found in the original in the archives at Hohenems. Concerning Hannibal's loss of favour with the Pope, see also the **report of Fr. Tonina of July 23, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] Mocenigo, 54.

Of this family, Charles, who was born at Arona, on the west shore of Lago Maggiore, on October 2nd, 1538,[1] deserved in the fullest degree the affection and confidence which his uncle showed him. The choice of this youth of twenty-one to be Secretary of State turned out to be a brilliant success. When Pius IV. made up his mind to this step he was moved, apart from family affection, at first only by the same considerations as had induced so many of his predecessors to act in a like manner. He believed, in view of the party differences in the Curia and the College of Cardinals, that he could only find a trustworthy confidant and fellow worker in his own family. That his choice fell on Charles Borromeo was a decisive factor for his whole reign. He found in him, above all, exactly what, as a man of independent character, he sought ; a most loyal assistant, who endeavoured, with the greatest devotion, with persevering diligence and inexhaustible patience, to carry out the instructions of the head of the Church.[2]

The members of the Curia, as well as the diplomatists, were little pleased with the new Secretary of State ; they had no hope of gaining any influence over the old, experienced Pope, through his youthful nephew, and besides this, the strict manner of his life, and the thoroughly ecclesiastical sentiments of Charles were not at all to the taste of those persons whose ideal was still the nepotist type of the Renaissance, and of this Charles Borromeo showed not the least trace. His personal appearance was neither made attractive by good looks, nor imposing by its dignity.[3] His excessive modesty of demeanour had the effect, at first, of concealing his intellectual gifts; his natural tendency to thoroughness and solidity rather than to outward brilliancy, did not lead him to any great communicativeness, or to put himself forward in any way.[1] A defect in his speech, which caused the words to be uttered too quickly, and of which he was only gradually cured, added to the unfavourable impression which he made,[2] while his modest reserve, as well as his scrupulous avoidance of benefitting by his position to enrich himself, or of enjoying life after the manner of the clerics of the Renaissance era, caused him to be looked upon at first as being of limited intelligence.[3] In the ambassadorial reports concerning the early work of the youthful Secretary of State, he is described as a pious and good young man, but as possessing few qualities of any importance for the transaction of worldly affairs.[4] In time,

---

[1] See the illustrations of the former castle and chapel, as well as the colossal statue of Charles Borromeo, which now rises above the ruins, in *San Carlo*, 11, 14, 27, 28.

[2] See Šusta, Kurie, I., xxxiii.

[3] Among the many portraits of Cardinal Borromeo, that painted by Figini, now in the Pinacotheca Ambrosiana, gives the best idea of his features, according to the testimony of Card. Federigo Borromeo. A reproduction of it is in *San Carlo*, 123 ; *cf.* 136. His death mask is now in the possession of the Capuchins of Porta Monforte. An illustration, *ibid.*, 520, 521. As an enemy of self-glorification, Charles Borromeo, contrary to the habit of

---

his contemporaries, set no value on preserving his portrait for his successors; in his extensive correspondence, he only once speaks of his portrait, which he sent to his sister, Anna; see Wymann, 107.

[1] "Ne insignes in literis progressus habere videretur (this refers to his time of study at Pavia), ingenii motus ad explicandum haud satis expediti faciebant. . . . Eam animi moderationem atque aequabilitatem haud maxima praesertim ingenii celeritate coniunctam, quidam quasi tarditatem abiectionemque despicere videbantur, cum tamen et ipsius adolescentiae acta non obscure et posterioris temporis res gestae multo illustrius longe aliter se rem habuisse demonstarint." Bascapè, 4b.

[2] Bascapè, 7a: concisas sententias, immo etiam verba ipsa imminuta habitu quodam nimiae celeritatis pronuntiare solebat.

[3] Bascapè, 6b; Giussano, 10D.

[4] Mocenigo, 53. In a *report of August 11, 1564, Fr. Tonina says of Charles Borromeo that he is "di natura freddo et per consuetudine timido al papa" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Requesens to Philip II., on April 30, 1564: "Es el hombre del mundo del menos espiritu y accion para tratar negocios" (Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 561). Requesens to Philip on January 5, 1565 (*ibid.* 581). "Aunque Borromeo es buen hombre y virtuoso, pienso que la tendria menos en la eleccion, que jumas tubo sobrino de Papa, porque es tan tibio, qui ne el attiende a tenelle, ne se la da nada." Requesens had later on an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the energy of Borromeo.

however, the opinion, even of the Venetian ambassadors, became more favourable.[1] Those who were brought into closer contact with him could not fail to notice that his intelligence was keen and his judgment clear,[2] and that what he lacked in quickness of comprehension or in keenness of perception, he made up by assiduous application. His great energy enabled him to consider any important question from every point of view, very often for as much as six hours at a time, without any feeling of fatigue, before he arrived at a definite decision.[3]

His firmness of character, his reliability and his deeply rooted piety were beyond all praise, and he had early given proofs of these qualities. Charles had been destined for the Church from his early youth, and educated to that end by a tutor at home, and hardly had he attained the age of fourteen in 1552,[4] when this young scion of the ancient noble family of Arona proceeded to the University of Pavia to study law. His father had given him a majordomo, but Charles soon had to dismiss him as being unsuitable,[5] and he was therefore thrown on his own resources immediately after leaving his father's home, and had to follow his own way independently. Filled with the thought that he owed it to his family, and especially to his two uncles, the commander-in-chief and the Cardinal, to distinguish himself, he applied himself with the greatest energy to his studies. In 1559, after many interruptions, partly caused by overwork, he passed his examinations as doctor of law with great distinction.[6] He attended to his religious duties most conscientiously and kept himself pure and unstained in the licentious university city.

---

[1] *Cf.* WYMANN, 97 *seq.*

[2] ut erat acri ingenio iudicioque; BASCAPÈ, 182a.

[3] *Ibid.*, 182b.

[4] Concerning the date, see SYLVAIN, I., 19; GIROL. SORANZO, 90.

[5] His second steward was hardly better (SYLVAIN, I., 21, 25). The opinion which he formed of this steward is characteristic of the future administrator; he writes to his father: "This man does not understand how to command." *San Carlo*, 25.

[6] SYLVAIN, I., 20; BASCAPÈ, 5a. *Cf.* L. GRAMATICA, Diploma di laurea in diritto canonico e civile di S. Carlo Borromeo, Milan, 1917.

The distinguishing quality of the future reformer, his unusual talent for government and administration, was very obvious even during these years of study. In Pavia he had to manage his household and superintend his servants,[1] and he performed this duty with the greatest skill, in spite of many difficulties, and a constant want of money.[2] During the vacations and the intervals in his studies, with his father's consent, he looked after the family estates,[3] and after the death of the latter in 1558, his elder brother, Federigo, was quite willing that Charles should undertake the management of the family and their father's fortune into his already experienced hands.[4] In accordance with the evil custom of the times, he had already, when a child, been appointed abbot in commendam of a Benedictine abbey, but the revenue from this he devoted, for the most part, and with his father s consent, to the poor.[5] He also endeavoured successfully to reform the monks, and when friendly measures did not avail, he made it his business to see that recourse was had to the punishment of imprisonment.[6]

Many other offices were soon bestowed on Charles by Pius IV. in addition to those he already held. The Pope appointed him Protector of Portugal, Lower Germany and the seven Catholic cantons of Switzerland, as well as Protector of the Franciscans, Carmelites, Humiliati, the Canons Regular of the Holy Cross at Coimbra, and of the orders of St. John and of Christ in Portugal.[7] The revenues from these dignities, and from the different abbeys which were entrusted to him in commendam, as well as from his family estates, were valued by the commercial mind of the Venetian ambassador, Girolamo Soranzo, in 1563, at about 48,000 scudi annually.[1]

---

[1] Sylvain, I., 25. [2] *Ibid.*, 22 *seqq.* [3] *Ibid.*, 28, 31.

[4] Rerum familiarium summa propter prudentiam morumque gravitatem ad eius iudicium rediit. Bascapè, 4-5.

[5] Bascapè, 4a.

[6] *Ibid.*, 5b: alios victus asperitate, alios arcta custodia punivit et in officio continuit, quamquam nullo eius generis tunc proposito exemplo.

[7] Bascapè, 15b. He became Protector of the Humiliati on February 13, 1560, (Sala, Dissertazioni, 414). The brief appointing him Protector of Switzerland on March 12, 1560, in Raynaldus, 1560, n. 95. *Cf.* Wymann, 85.

The foreign ambassadors were filled with wonder that the Pope's youthful nephew was not seduced by all these honours and riches to give himself up to the pleasures of life. Nor was there the least sign of haughtiness about him, and his whole manner of life remained, according to the universal testimony of his contemporaries, without a stain.[2] He threw himself into his work with so much zeal, that at first his attendants feared that his health would be impaired. One of his intimate friends writes that he hardly allowed himself time to eat or to sleep in peace, and begs the uncle of Charles, Count Francesco, that he and Count Guido Borromeo would remonstrate with their nephew as much as lay in their power, for he was deaf to all the expostulations of his servants.[3] Charles himself wrote on January 22nd, 1560, that he was well in health, in spite of the "endless strain," but that he found it hard to save as much as five or six hours for sleep.[1] Entirely giving up his own inclinations and plans, he placed himself altogether at the disposal of the Pope,[2] keeping as much at his side as possible the whole day long, and going every morning to the secretary of the State Chancery, Tolomeo Galli,[3] for a conference two or three hours in length, concerning the reports and suits which had to be settled.[4] The documents which arrived every day in great numbers at the office of the Secretary of State had immediately to be summarized and entered on short narrow octavo sheets. These extracts served Borromeo and Galli as the basis of their report to the Pope. The decisions, to which Pius IV. came very quickly, were often noted in short expressive notes in pencil on the reverse side of the extracts, and were then made use of for the replies. The minutes which had been prepared in the office of the Secretary of State were again revised, either by Charles or, perhaps, the Pope himself, before a fair copy was finally made,

---

[1] ALBÈRI, II., 4, 92. According to Soranzo, the archbishopric of Milan yielded him 7,000 scudi, the abbey of Arona 2,000, the abbeys of Mozzo, della Follina, Colle (in Venetian territory) 3,000, Nonantola 3,000, an abbey in the Neapolitan territory 1,000. The Spanish King paid him 12,000 scudi, of which he gave up 3,000 to Card. Altemps The legation of Bologna brought him in 7,000, that of Ravenna 5,000, and the administration of Spoleto 3,000. From four galleys which Federigo had left him, and which were in the service of Spain, he drew 1,000 scudi each, and the revenues from his father's estates amounted to 4,000 scudi. Bascapè testifies (p. 6b) that many of these benefices were forced on him by the Pope. As abbot in commendam, Charles possessed, according to Bascapè (pp. 15, 16) twelve churches; his revenues occasionally amounted to 90,000 ducats. A pension of 12,000 ducats, which Philip II. had assigned to him in connection with the archbishopric of Toledo, was in reality never paid. GIROL. SORANZO, 95.

[2] GIROL. SORANZO, 91: "E il Cardinale di una vita innocentissima, tanto chè, per quello che si sa, si può dir che sia netto da ogni macchia." GIAC. SORANZO 133: "La vita sua è innocentissima e castissima."

[3] Ercole Lodi to Count Guido Borromeo on February 17, 1560 (published by E. MOTTA in the Archivio storico Lombardo, 1900,

---

352 *seq.*) : "Resta al presente tanto occupato nelli negocii ch' apena ci avanza tempo per poter comodamente mangiar e dormire. Il che a noi altri servitori suoi è di grandissimo scontento per la temenza tenemo che . . . finalmente non caschi in qualche grave infirmità. . . . Si mostra talmente infiamato del ben publico et tanto inamorato del negocio che pare in effetto unico." *Cf.* also the *letter of Fr. Tonina of May 14, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). The appointment of Paolo Odescalchi as "assistente delle audientie" points to some slight relief for Borromeo. *Non haverà, says an Avviso di Roma of January 31, 1562, tanti fastidii che certo non haveva troppo. (Urb. 1039, p. 335b Vatican Archives).

[1] SYLVAIN, I., 50.

[2] Ha lasciato tutti gli altri suoi pensieri e piaceri per compiacer la Santità Sua. GIROL. SORANZO, 91.

[3] Concerning Tolomeo Galli (born 1526 or 1527 at Como) and his position as "secretarius intimus," see SICKEL, Berichte, I., 44 *seqq.;* ŠUSTA, Kurie, I., xxxiv, and TÖRNE, Ptolomée Gallio, 55 *seq.* See also RICHARD in the Revue d'hist. ecclés., XI. (1910), 521.

[4] *Cf.* GIROL. SORANZO, 77; GIAC. SORANZO, 135.

and sometimes even these were again examined by the Pope. The instructions for the nuncios and legates were always drawn up in the name of Borromeo, who often added long notes to his signature. The Cardinal also often wrote long letters in his own hand; those drawn up in the name of the Pope only dealt with important matters, or when the person addressed had to be specially honoured, and in such cases Pius IV. often added postscripts in his own hand, and these were seldom wanting in precision.[1]

Almost the whole of the diplomatic correspondence passed through the hands of Borromeo, so that he was thus engaged in all the great questions of European politics, besides those in connection with purely ecclesiastical affairs. He also had to decide in the matter of petitions for pardon from condemned criminals, recommendations for appointments, decrees against bandits, letters of complaint, and many other similar matters of lesser importance.[2] Besides these exacting duties, the

---

[1] Concerning the daily routine in the office of the Secretary of State, and the staff employed there, see, besides the excellent and comprehensive description by Šusta, Kurie I., xxxiv *seq.*, lxxv., the detailed account in Sickel, Berichte, I., 44 *seqq.*, 65 *seqq.*, 72 *seqq.*, 83 *seqq.*; II., 15 *seqq.*, 22 *seqq.*, 28 *seqq.*; III., 39 *seqq.*, 99 *seqq.* See also Sickel, Ein Ruolo di famiglia des Papstes Pius IV., Mitteilungen des Österr. Instit., XIV., 581 *seq.*, and Törne, 41, 74 *seqq.* Concerning Borromeo's excellent Uditore, G. Fr. Bonhomini, see Ehses-Meister, Nuntiaturberichte, I., 1, xvi, Paderborn, 1895; Reinhardt-Steffens, G. Fr. Bonhomini, Einl. p. xxv. Examples of the strictness of Pius IV. with regard to his secretaries, in the *Avvisi di Roma of April 6 and 13, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 145b, 147, Vatican Library). *Cf.* also Sickel, Berichte, II., 61 n. 1.

[2] The many documents which Sala (Documenti, Vol. 3) has collected, give an idea of these activities. How everyone who wished to approach the Pope applied to Borromeo is shown by the letter of complaint of Scipione Saurolo against Michelangelo's Last Judgment, which is addressed to Borromeo. It is printed in Sala, Documenti III., 90 *seq.* Several of Borromeo's letters to Lucca (concerning the repression of heresy, etc.) are published by E. Lazzareschi in La Scuola catt., Ser. 4, XVIII., 279-95

Cardinal held a conference three times a week with eight legal experts, concerning current affairs in connection with the administration of the States of the Church.[1] In addition to all these duties there were frequent meetings of the congregations of Cardinals, such as that on Thursdays for the reform of the Church, at which Borromeo had to be present,[2] while for recreation he had the evening discussions in the academy which he had founded, under the title of "Vatican Nights," where Latin theses were read and discussed.[3]

In spite of these splendid examples of self-sacrificing devotion to duty, Borromeo was still far from being the strict ascetic of his later years. He was passionately fond of the chase, and followed it for the benefit of his health more eagerly than his friends thought consistent with the dignity of a Cardinal.[4] He paid great attention to the magnificence of his household, although he was for those days very moderate in his personal requirements, but his court consisted of 150 persons, who were clothed from head to foot in black velvet.[5]

(1900). *Cf.* also G. CASTELLANI, Una lettera di S. Carlo Borromeo [of May 4, 1560] a proposito della sacca di Fano: Rivista Ital. di numismatica, 1908.

[1] GIROL. SORANZO, 91; GIAC. SORANZO, 135.

[2] Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 343.

[3] GIROL. SORANZO, 91; TIRABOSCHI, VII., 45, 198; SAXIUS, Noctes Vatic. Mediol., 1738; KUNZ, Biblithek für kath. Pädagogik, I., 20; SPROTTE, Zur Gesch. des hl. Karl Borromäus, Oppeln, 1893; *San Carlo*, 61.

[4] Anal. Boll. 25 (1906), 521. The remark of Bascapè (p. 6a) must refer to this, as well as to the game of ball: "Quotidianas etiam oblectationes quasdam sacrae disciplinae non satis consentaneas admittebat"; *cf.* p. 9a: "exercitatione corporis ad id tempus valetudinis gratia magnopere delectatus." On December 4, 1561, Borromeo begs the nuncio Delfino to send him suitable sporting dogs from Germany (STEINHERZ, Nuntiaturberichte, I., 324). Fr. Tonina speaks of a hunt of Borromeo in a *letter of October 22, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[5] GIROL. SORANZO, 92; LODI, in the Archivio stor. Lomb., 1903, 355. The Papal court consisted of 1500 persons; *cf.* GIROL. SORANZO, 96.

He wished the Borromeo family to make an appearance which should correspond in every way with their present princely rank. His creation as Cardinal he announced to his family in the simplest manner, and he desired that the happy event should only be celebrated in Arona, and especially by masses of the Holy Ghost. At the same time, however, he desired that his sister should have for the future two ladies as companions, and these were to be of noble birth and of good reputation.[1] He expressed himself as filled with joy in his letters when his sisters, through the efforts of their uncle and the zealous co-operation of their brother, made aristocratic and wealthy marriages with the Gonzaga, Colonna, Altemps, and the princes of Venosa.[2] On the other hand, when a less wealthy relative was about to marry beneath her rank, and thus lower the dignity of the family, he showed himself very much troubled.[3]

Cardinal Borromeo took a particular interest in the fortunes of his only brother, Federigo, who had espoused the daughter of the Duke of Urbino, Virginia della Rovere, in 1560. The whole Borromeo family was justly proud of this alliance, which gave rise to the most flattering hopes. Federigo, on whose head fortune seemed to shower her gifts with a lavish hand, was of a quiet and retiring temperament, and does not seem to have aspired to exercise any influence in affairs of state.[1] In spite of this, foreign princes eagerly sought his favour, especially Cosimo I., who presented to him the magnificent Altoviti palace in December, 1560, as well as a considerable sum of money,[2] the relations of the Borromeo family to the Duke of Florence being as close as those between father and son.[3]

---

[1] Letter of January 31, 1560, in SYLVAIN, I., 54.

[2] *San Carlo*, II. (1910), 278 *seqq.*; SYLVAIN, I., 57 *seqq.*, 73; SALA, Documenti, III., 13, 17, 22 *seq.*, 325 *seq.*, 328. Camilla, Charles' sister, in 1560, married Cesare Gonzaga, Count of Guastalla, Duke of Molfetta, Prince of Ariano, who died in 1573 (CARO, III., 284, 287 *seq.*, 290, 292, 297). She died in 1583. A second sister, Geronima, married Fabrizio Gesualdo, Prince of Venosa, and a third, Anna, married Fabrizio Colonna, in 1562 (died 1580), the eldest son of Marcantonio (*cf.* ŠUSTA, Kurie, II., 258, 261, 291, 525; *report of Fr. Tonina of June 11, 1562, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). She died in 1582. There was a daughter, the issue of a second marriage of Gilberto Borromeo to Taddea del Verme, who was married with great pomp to Hannibal von Hohenems on January 6, 1565 (*cf.* SALA, Fascicolo conclus., 47; *San Carlo, loc. cit.*; WYMANN, 63). An *Avviso di Roma of June 28, 1561, announces the arrival of the four sisters of Charles Borromeo in Rome (Urb. 1039, p. 283, Vatican Library).

[3] SYLVAIN, I., 66.

On April 2nd, Pius IV. appointed the youthful head of the Borromeo family to be Captain-General of the Church, and solemnly presented his beloved Federigo with the Marshal's baton, which carried with it a monthly pension of 1,000 ducats.[4] On the 22nd of the same month Federigo went to Trent as the representative of the Pope, in order to give the daughter of the King of the Romans, Ferdinand, the bride of the Duke of Mantua, an escort of honour to her new home.[5] A year later, when Philip II. was preparing to raise Federigo, who till now had been a count, to the dignity of Marquis of Oria, it really seemed as though the name of Borromeo would soon be able to rival that of Farnese or Medici in splendour and renown. Unfortunately Federigo quite unexpectedly succumbed to an attack of fever on December 19th, 1562, after an illness of only eight days.[6] The magnificent funeral obsequies which were held for this youth who had been so suddenly snatched away from life, almost seemed to be the funeral rites for the glory of the house of Borromeo. Cardinal Borromeo might well see in the gold-embroidered pall which covered the coffin,[1] as it lay in state under a gilded canopy at the obsequies on November 25th, a symbol of the splendid downfall of his family.

---

[1] *Cf.* Mocenigo, 53; Šusta, Kurie, I., xxxii *seq.*

[2] See the *letter of Fr. Tonina of December 14, 1560 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] See with regard to this and the later change in the relations, the interesting **report of Fr. Tonina of January 29, 1563 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[4] See Bondonus, 541.

[5] See Massarelli in Merkle, 355; Bondonus, 549. *Cf.* C. Giuliani in the Arch. Trentino, III. (1884), 14 *seq.*

[6] See Bondonus, 543, where however, what the otherwise careful editor Merkle has overlooked, November 19 is certainly correct and not August 19. The former date has various other authorities in its support, besides that already cited in Sickel, Berichte, III., 90 *seq.*, and Šusta, Kurie, III., 89 *seq.* viz.: (1)

The sudden death of this much-loved nephew at the early age of twenty-seven, filled the Pope with the deepest sorrow.[2]

A letter from Borromeo to Cesare Gonzaga of November 19, 1562, in SALA, Documenti, III., 241. (2) A *letter of Fr. Tonina of November 20, 1562 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). (3) A *letter of Alf. Roselli of November 19, 1562 (State Archives, Modena). *Cf.* also Borromeo's letters of November 24, 1562 (with wrong date 1561, as erroneously printed in SALA, Docum., III., 99), December 3, 1562, April 5, 1563, September 2, 1564 (removal of the body to Milan), in SALA, Docum., III., 242, 262, 308. The news of his having received the marquisate of Oria only arrived when Federigo was in his last moments (KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE, III., 212; SICKEL, Konzil, 403). A satirical epitaph on F. Borromeo in Giorn. d. lett. Ital., XXXVI., 212.

[1] BONDONUS, 544. *Letter of Alf. Roselli of November 25, 1562 (State Archives, Modena).

[2] On November 18, 1562, when Federigo's state had become hopeless, Fr. Tonina reports: "*N.S. ni ha sentito et sente infinito dispiacere et questa notte gli andò a otto hore a vederlo et egli poi, o per dispiacere o per il disturbo, si dice che vomitò quanto hieri havea magnato et resta anch' esso travagliato." On November 20 Tonina writes: "*Resta adunque dirle che N.S. ha sentito et sente di questa morte infinito dolore, et chi fu presente dice che disse, Manus Domini tetigit me, et un altra volte disse, orsu bisogna portrala in pace, questi sono i nostri peccati." In an *Avviso di Roma of November 21, 1562, it is stated: "S.S^{ta} quand' ebbe tal nuova stava a far segnatura e sospese la penna, tornò a seguirla et prestandogli il card. Borromeo disse: Manus Domini tetigit nos" (State Archives, Naples, C. Farnes.). According to the *report of Tonina of November 28, 1562, the Pope deplored in the Congregation of Monday, with tears in his eyes, the death of this "filius dilectus, solamen suum" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). According to the *report of

He bore it, however, with resignation, for he saw in this crushing blow, which destroyed all his plans for the elevation of his nephew, a punishment from heaven for the exaggerated concessions which he had made to the Spanish king[1] with regard to the use of ecclesiastical revenues, with the intention of thereby promoting the interests of Federigo. The sudden destruction of such brilliant hopes also made a deep impression on Cardinal Borromeo,[2] all the more so as, almost at the same time as he lost his beloved brother, the young son of the Duke of Florence, who had received the Cardinal's hat at the same time as himself, suddenly died after a three days' illness.[3]

The ascetic nature of Charles had for long resisted making any concessions to the more worldly conceptions of life,[4] and now that the futility of all merely earthly aspirations was so rudely brought before his eyes, he resolved to free himself from the last traces of a worldly spirit, and to devote his life exclusively to the supreme goal.

The worldly-minded members of the Curia, and, as was

Alf. Roselli of November 25, the Pope had then spoken in a composed and courageous manner; on December 5, however, the same writer reports: "* Il Papa non puo scordarsi la morte del conte Federigo Borromeo, massime non sapendo risolversi di soggetto per perpetuarvi la casa sua non inclinando al fratello" (State Archives, Modena).

[1] It was a question of the heavy tax on church property granted for the fleet of Philip II.; see the *report of Alf. Roselli of November 21, 1562 (State Archives, Modena). *Cf.* with regard to this affair, Vol. XVI. of this work.

[2] See his letter to Cosimo in Sala, Docum., III., 241 *seq.* The importance of this death has already been pointed out by Pallavicini (19, 4, 9). Ranke has underestimated it, as Sickel justly remarks (Berichte III., 83). A contemporary portrait of Federigo is in the Ambrosiana, and another in the castle of the Borromei at Angera. Reproductions in *San Carlo*, 37, 55.

[3] Bondonus, 544. "Questi due si gravi colpi . . . erano veramente atti ad atterarmi affatto, se hen fossi stato assai più forte di quello ch'io sono," writes Borromeo on December 3, 1562, to the Duke of Florence. Sala, Docum., III., 242.

[4] Bascapè, 8b.

believed, the Pope himself, drew quite other conclusions from these events. It was supposed that the heir of all the Borromeo riches would now give up his clerical career, and, in the place of his dead brother, carry on the family.[1] Although Charles was already a sub-deacon, and as such had taken a vow of chastity, a Papal dispensation did not seem unlikely in his case. The Cardinal, however, put an end to any such expectations by receiving holy orders from Cardinal Cesi on July 17th, 1563. He took this step with the consent of the Pope, who had raised his nephew to the rank of Cardinal-Priest at the consistory of June 4th, 1563, and had thereby given him the express command to receive holy orders, declaring at the same time that he had never intended to force Charles to give up the priesthood, and that all rumours to the contrary were unfounded.[2] Borromeo was much strengthened in his resolutions by the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius of Loyola, which he made under the direction of the Jesuit, Ribera.[3] He said his first mass publicly, and with great solemnity in St. Peter's, at the altar of the Confession of the Prince of the Apostles, and his second in complete privacy in the chapel which had been used by Ignatius of Loyola.[4]

After having received holy orders, Borromeo at first retained his court and state, but was always growing stricter towards his own person, and to such a degree that he now denied himself even the distraction of a walk. The discussions in his academy of the "Vatican Nights" now related more closely to spiritual matters, and he also began to fill in the gaps in his theological education by having lectures in philosophy and theology given to him. For some time he even thought of resigning his office of Secretary of State and retiring into the strict order of Camaldoli. The Bishop of Braga, however, Bartolomeo de Martyribus, dissuaded him from this step during a visit to Rome in 1563.[1] Charles repeatedly begged the Pope to allow him to visit his archbishopric,[2] at least for a time, and to forego a part of the rich benefices which had been assigned to him.

---

[1] BASCAPÈ, 9a; KERVYN DE LETTENHOVE, III., 212. See the report of Arcos of December, 1562, in SICKEL, Konzil, 410. In yet another *letter from Cardinal Mark Sittich to Hannibal von Hohenems, dated May 3, 1563, reference is made to the possibility of Cardinal Borromeo marrying (Hohenems Archives). On June 7, 1563, Cardinal Borromeo was invested with the freedom of the city of Rome; see GREGOROVIUS, Kleine Schriften, I., 316.

[2] See Acta consist. in ŠUSTA, Kurie, IV., 68 n. 3; (van Ortroy) in the Anal. Boll., XIV. (1895), 436, according to the dispatches of the Imperial ambassador in Rome, Prospero d'Arco. *Cf.* Borromeo's letter to Cesare Gonzaga of June 5, 1563, in SALA, Documenti, III., 269. The statement in GUISSANO, 20 *seq.*, that Charles had secretly received Holy Orders against the wish of his uncle is therefore erroneous.

[3] GIUSSANO, 21; SACCHINI, 8, 12 (p. 406).

[4] SACCHINI, 7, 11 (p. 362). SYLVAIN, I., 77.

This change in the manner of life of the most important and the most highly esteemed Cardinal caused a great sensation in Rome, where many considered it worthy of blame, while even the friends of ecclesiastical reform were of opinion that, as might have been expected from his energetic and strict character, in many respects he went too far. Dissatisfaction was especially expressed against Ribera and the Jesuits, it being said that they had drawn the Cardinal into their nets to get money out of him, or even to prevail upon him to enter the Society. Similar rumours penetrated even to Pius IV., who appears to have given some credence to them, for, according to a letter from the Spanish ambassador, Requesens, of April 30th, 1564, the Pope showed great displeasure at the fact that Cardinal Borromeo had cut down the service at his table, and his whole household, besides having given other signs of his contempt for the world. He said that these were melancholy notions savouring of the Theatines, and he commanded that the Jesuits and other religious orders should be informed that he would punish them if they set foot in the house of the Cardinal.[1] The feeling against the Jesuits was so strong and so wide-spread that the secretary of the Order, Polanco, thought it necessary to send a letter in his own hand to Spain, in which he made the matter clear, and denied any responsibility on the part of the members of the Order for the steps taken by the Cardinal.[2]

---

[1] BASCAPÈ, 9 *seq.* *Cf.* *San Carlo*, I. (1908), 98. He still retained later on a predilection for Camaldoli and the Camaldolesi; *cf.* his letters of May 6, 1564, November 12, 1572; December 13, 1574, in SALA, Docum., III., 298, 442, 560.

[2] The appointment of Charles as Archbishop of Milan took place in May, 1564; before that he had only been the administrator. He had already been consecrated bishop on December 7, 1563. See SALA, Documenti, III., 817, 819 *seq.*

However compliant Charles Borromeo had hitherto been in giving way to the wishes of his uncle, he would not make the slightest concession to him in the matter of any mitigation of his severe rule of life. On the contrary, his strictness continued to increase, especially after the close of the Council of Trent. In June, 1564, his court and state were reduced to a great extent; about eighty persons, who seemed little suited for a clerical life, were dismissed and otherwise provided for, while those who remained were forbidden the use of silken garments and other luxuries. On one day in the week, the Cardinal took nothing but bread and water; he devoted yet more hours of the day to devotion than before;

---

[1] Requesens to Philip II. in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 561, confirmed by the *reports of Fr. Tonina of April 22 and 29, 1564 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, Appendix Nos. 34 and 35). Pius IV., however, had only forbidden Lainez and Ribera to have access to Borromeo, the messenger who delivered the Pope's order extended it to all Jesuits. CANISII Epist., IV., 532.

[2] Polanco to Araoz on April 28, 1564, printed in ASTRAIN, II., 208 *seq.* *Cf.* CANISII Epist., IV., 531 *seq.* Polanco as well as Bascapè (p. 9a) hints that Charles sometimes went too far: "Eaque fuit in moribus omnique vitae consuetudine gravitas, ut ad austeritatem quoque perveniret, quemadmodum saepe solet initio vitae religiosioris evenire." The thought of even denying himself a walk was attributed to Charles by Egidio Foscarari, according to Bascapè (p. 9a). Ribera received in the following year the long sought permission to go to the foreign missions. A letter of farewell to him from Borromeo, on February 3, 1565, in SALA, Documenti, III., 331 *seq.*

and in spite of the difficulty he had to contend with in speaking in public, he began to preach, a thing hitherto unknown for a Cardinal to do.[1] He performed the most severe penances in secret, a scourge with spikes serving the purpose of lacerating his tender body, and sometimes he also used a triple chain, held together by a knot. The curiosity of his chamberlain, Ambrogio Fornero, discovered these instruments of penance, when the Cardinal once forgot to remove the key from the box in which they were hidden from the gaze of those not intended to see them. Soranzo declares in 1565 that Borromeo had become extremely thin, through his zeal for work and study, as well as his fasts, vigils, and other mortifications. Borromeo kept up his strength in a wonderful way, and it was only at the end of the reign of Pius V. that a complete breakdown of his health took place.[2]

---

[1] Bascapè, 9-10. The date, which is missing, can be seen from a letter of Fr. Tonina of June 10, 1564; "*Il card. Borromeo ha cassata tutta la famiglia sua, cento boche in poi, et a molti anco delli ritenuti ha levata la spesa del cavallo et d' un servitore." Among those dismissed at that time was Camillo Capilupi (see Arch. stor. Lomb., XX. (1893), 697). The undated *letter of Fr. Tonina of 1564, refers to the same, in which he says: "Il s. card^{le} Borromeo ha retirata la sua famiglia in 80 persone et la stalla in 20 cavalli, et camina tuttavia restringendosi et due volte la settimana ordinariamente si reduce alli Giesuiti a conferire con un eccel^{te} theologo che vi si trova, nelle cose di theologia et di conscienza, et sopra questo dicono che S.B^{ne} un dì disse, non vogliamo attender a viver più che posiamo et alegramente, se Mons^{r} Borromei pur si vorrà far frate gli pagaremo li vestimenti del nostro, parlando così di burla. S. B^{ne} fa ogni instanza a quanti pochi vescovi che sono qui che vadino a loro vescovati, et de qui nasce che quelle che gli hanno miseri ogni dì rinonciano più presto che andare, come molti hanno fatto" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). In a *letter of Cardinal Mark Sittich to Hannibal von Hohenems, dated June 15, 1564, there are also comments on the significant reduction of the court and state of Charles, from which people might suppose that he was becoming a fool from mere parsimony; this is the effect of his dealings with the "Theatines" (Original in Hohenems Archives).

[2] See D'Alessandri, 2, 407 *seq.*; Wymann, 95, 108, 118.

In time people ceased to find fault with the asceticism of Charles, and his example had an effect, even in the case of the worldly-minded diplomatists. Their testimony is all the more valuable and worthy of credence, as they were in the habit of ruthlessly laying bare the human weaknesses of even the highest dignitaries. When Girolamo Soranzo gave a report of his Roman embassy in June, 1563, he remarked : " The life of Cardinal Borromeo is most innocent, and absolutely blameless ; by his religious attitude he gives an example which could not be surpassed. His exemplary manner of life is all the more worthy of praise as he is in the flower of his age, and is the very powerful nephew of a Pope, and lives at a court where the opportunity of enjoying pleasures of every kind is certainly not wanting to him."[1] Two years later the Venetian, Giacomo Soranzo, wrote : " Cardinal Borromeo is only twenty-seven, but delicate, as he has impaired his health by study, fasting, vigils and abstinences. He is a doctor of laws, but devotes himself to theology with a zeal rare in our days. His life is most unworldly, and his zeal for religion is so great that one can say with all authority that by his example he is of more use to the Roman court than all the decrees of the Council. This nephew, so loved by the Pope, still in the bloom of youth and at a court full of temptations, who has overcome himself and the love of the world, is a rare phenomenon. Borromeo is devoted to the Pope, who, for his part thinks the world of him and his wishes, as may be seen in the last promotion of Cardinals, when only such were chosen as he had either proposed or recommended. He and the Pope, however, are of two different natures, and Pius IV. would like to see him more jovial and less strict in his life and ideas. He even said so to the Jesuits, who have a great influence on the Cardinal's manner of life, but the latter did not allow himself to be diverted from his own way. He is not much loved at court, because they are used to other ways there, and they complain that the Cardinal asks the Pope for little and gives little of his own. As to the first, it is with him a matter of conscience, while as far as his own is concerned, he uses it for alms, for the portions of penniless maidens, and for the payment of the debts which his brother left."[1] It is clear how lavishly Borromeo distributed alms from the fact that at that time he spent hardly anything on himself, from the revenues which accrued to him from the archbishopric of Milan.[2] The Borromeo College in Pavia is a magnificent foundation dating from his days in Rome, and which he caused to be erected in 1564 by the architect, Pellegrino Pellegrini, to protect poor students of noble family from the dangers which he had learned to know in his own student days.[3] As a striking testimony to his benevolence, the table is still preserved in S. Prassede, at which he served the poor with food.[4]

---

[1] GIROL. SORANZO, 91. *Cf.* WYMANN in the Schweiz. Kirchenzeitung, 1910, No. 44, n. 49.

Next to Charles Borromeo, Pius IV. greatly valued in the early days of his reign, Cardinal Morone, who was a man of very wide experience, especially in affairs relating to Germany.[1] He gave him, however, as little as to the other Cardinals, a decisive influence over his plans. However much the Papal court and the diplomatists might wonder, Pius IV. persisted in reserving the affairs of state to his own cool judgment. He was led to this, not only by his own self-confidence, but also by a deep distrust of the Cardinals, of whom hardly one was quite independent of the influence of foreign princes.[2] Girolamo Soranzo thinks that the vaccillating attitude which the Pope often displayed is to be attributed to the fact that he did not consult with others. "As His Holiness is of a very hasty temperament," the Venetian explains, "even with regard to the most important affairs, he comes to a decision very rapidly; should difficulties then arise, he shows no obstinate persistence, but alters his decisions quickly and completely."[3]

---

[1] GIAC. SORANZO, 133 *seq.* Cardinal Seripando *writes on July 28, 1562, to Trent to Paolo Manuzio concerning Borromeo: "E huomo di frutto et non di fiore, de' fatti et non di parole" (Library at Montpellier). Bascapè also says (p. 66) that Charles showed a certain want of generosity at first. This struck people more than was perhaps right, as they had been accustomed since the time of the Renaissance to see the great nobles scattering gold and favours with great prodigality (*cf.* WYMANN, 98). A proof of Borromeo's zeal for study is shown by two tickets, of June 20 and November 29, 1564, which are still in existence, by which permission is given to him to borrow books from the Vatican Library, and indeed, in virtue of the second, "volumina etiam registra nuncupata, et quae forsan, ne adeo omnibus ostenderentur, magis reservata et custodita essent." Mitteilungen des Österr. Instituts, XVII. (1896), 293.

[2] BASCAPÈ, 6-7.

[3] GUISSANO, 22. Concerning the date of the foundation see *San Carlo*, 209, concerning the college *cf.* NATALI in Natura ed arte, February, 1906. The statutes of the Roman Monte di Pietà, of 1565, can probably be traced to Borromeo. DONATO TAMILIA, Il sacro monte de pietà di Roma, Rome, 1900.

[4] Illustration in *San Carlo*, 69.

The sense of statesmanship which, besides the great independence of his decisions, was characteristic of Pius IV., showed itself especially in his dealings with the secular princes. In this respect he followed an exactly opposite policy to that of his predecessor. While Paul IV., with a strange want of appreciation of the true state of public affairs, imagined that he could treat the princes, not as his sons, but as his subjects,[4] the shrewd Lombard believed that, in view of the great defections from Rome, the authority of ecclesiastical power must be strengthened by the support of the secular princes. To this cause is to be attributed his moderation and his conciliatory attitude towards them.[1]

---

[1] See MOCENIGO, 40 *seq*. *Cf*. *Avviso di Roma of December 30, 1559, and those of January 13 and November 23, 1560, Urb. 1039 (pp. 112, 117, 218, Vatican Library). See further HILLIGER, 20 *seq*. Later, in the summer of 1561, Morone retired; Mula and Navagero then became the confidants of Pius IV. (see SICKEL, Konzil, 204). In April, 1561, however, Morone still had great influence; see the *report of Saraceni of April 11, 1561 (State Archives, Florence). Pius IV. had great confidence in Hosius in 1561, with regard to German affairs; see *letter of G. A. Caligari of to Commendone, dated Rome, September 27, 1561 (Lett. id. princ., XXIII., 36, Papal Secret Archives).

[2] See GIROL. SORANZO, 74; GIAC. SORANZO, 130; P. TIEPOLO, 178.

[3] GIROL. SORANZO, 75.

[4] *Cf*. Vol. XIV. of this work, pp. 69, 74.

Ferdinand I., whose succession to the Imperial dignity Paul IV. had always obstinately refused to acknowledge, was the first to experience this conciliatory attitude.[2] It was very soon seen that Pius IV. intended, as soon as possible, to put an end to this unhappy dispute, which was so hurtful to the Catholic cause in Germany. On December 30th, 1559, the Pope declared to the Cardinals that he did not consider it of any use to contest Ferdinand's election, for, although non-Catholics had taken part in it, the Catholics had done so as well. He referred emphatically to Ferdinand's zeal for the cause of religion, and to his services as the defender of Christendom in the war against the Turks. All the Cardinals, with one exception, agreed to concede the Imperial title to the King of Hungary and Bohemia, under the condition, however, that Ferdinand should make apologies for having taken possession of the Hungarian bishoprics, for the Treaty of Passau, and for other decisions made by the Diet. Ferdinand, highly delighted at this change of policy in Rome, declared himself ready to do so, and at once assured the Pope, through his ambassador, Thurm, that he would do his utmost to bring about the return of his son, Maximilian, to the Church. As the question, based on principle, as to whether Papal recognition was necessary for the lawful accession of the Emperor to the throne, was not touched upon, the reconciliation with Rome was assured by this concession to Ferdinand.[3]

---

[1] See MOCENIGO, 61-2; GIROL. SORANZO, 75. Pius IV. emphasized the great defection from Rome, and the necessity for the reform of ecclesiastical conditions, in the brief by which he notified his election (to Philip II., Venice, Portugal, Florence) on December 29 and 30, 1559; see Min. brev., Arm., 44, t 10, n. 419, 420, 413, 418, Papal Secret Archives.

[2] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 351 *seq.*

[3] *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 22 *seq.*, 76 *seq.*; REIMANN in the Abhandlungen der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für Kultur, 1871, 37 *seq.*; SCHMID, Kaiser- und Königswahl, 35 *seq.*

A difficulty which arose at the last moment was also happily removed. The representative of Ferdinand I., Scipione d'Arco, who had arrived in Rome on February 12th, 1560, and had taken up his residence in the Vatican, had orders to congratulate the Pope on his accession in a public audience, and to assure him of respect and homage in the name of the Emperor. The Pope, however, required in addition the oath of obedience. Arco hesitated, and it was only when Cardinals Morone and Madruzzo reasoned with him that he decided to exceed his authority and comply with the wish of the Pope.[1] Thereupon the ceremony of the *obedientia* by the Emperor's representative took place in a public consistory in the Sala Regia, on February 17th, 1560.[2] The conclusion of peace between the two greatest powers of Christendom was sealed by the restoration of the nunciature at the Imperial court.

Pius IV. once more filled the nunciatures of Venice and Florence, left vacant at the death of Paul IV., and also changed the holders of the remaining nunciatures. All this took place in the small space of three months. This, and the fact that not one of Paul IV.'s nuncios was sent to a new post, clearly shows that the Pope was acting in pursuance of a carefully thought-out plan, by which he removed all the diplomatists of his predecessor. The Pope also took steps as early as the summer of 1560, to found permanent nunciatures at Turin and Florence. The new Swiss nuncio, Giovan Antonio Volpi, Bishop of Como, received permission to remain in his diocese, from whence he could more easily reach the Catholic parts of Switzerland than from Lucerne. The exclusion from the cardinalate of all those nuncios who had been recommended by a prince to whom they were accredited, was a most salutary proceeding.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 42 *seq.;* Correspondence of Card. O. Truchsess, 136; SCHMID, *loc. cit.*, 36 *seq.* It was remarkable, as Zwiedinek points out in the Archiv für österr. Gesch., LVIII, 176, that Pius IV. did not take exception to the person of Arco, as the Popes usually accepted only members of the princely houses of the Empire as *obedientia* envoys. Pius thus proved his compliant attitude in this matter. Concerning the plan for crowning the Emperor, see Venetian despatches, III., 133 *seqq.*, 141; concerning Scipione d'Arco, see CONSTANT, Rapport, 3 *seq.*

[2] See BONDONUS, 533; SCHLECHT in the Hist. Jahrbuch, XIV., 22 *seq.;* SCHMID, *loc. cit.*

The resumption of diplomatic relations which had been interrupted during the pontificate of Paul IV., as well as the development of the nunciatures, indicate the value which the new Pope attached to the keeping up of friendly relations with the secular powers. The beginning of the reign of Pius IV. also showed a strong contrast to that of his predecessor in the Eternal City itself. How the Romans rejoiced when the Pope, in February, 1560, again permitted the carnival festivities! At the same time, however, steps were rightly taken to prevent abuses.[2]

It was not only the Romans who rejoiced when one of the first official acts of the new Pope was to limit once more the powers of the Inquisition to its original and proper sphere,[3] and to mitigate many of the excessively harsh reform decrees of Paul IV. This showed itself first in the matter of the examination of candidates for bishoprics, as to which, however, the essential points of the reforms of the Carafa Pope were retained.[1] Other mitigations of the rigorous decrees of Paul IV. soon followed.[2]

---

[1] See BIAUDET, Nonciatures, 24 *seq.*, 58, 296 *seq.* Concerning Volpi, see REINHARDT-STEFFENS, G. Fr. Bonhomini, Einl., p. xxviii, *seq.* The Florentine nuntiature, as to which Scaduto makes misleading statements (see Hist. Jahrbuch, IX., 108) is worthy of a special monograph.

[2] *Cf.* CLEMENTI, 218; RODOCANACHI, Juifs, 209; Arch. stor. Lomb., XIX. (1908), 353. Things were already fairly free at the carnival of 1561. One of the principal amusements was bull-fighting (*cf.* KÖLN. Volkzeitung, 1911, No. 168) against the holding of which in the neighbourhood of the Jesuit College Lainez made a complaint; see the **reports of Fr. Tonina of January 18 and 29, and February 13 and 19, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). A new *Bando per le maschere of January 20, 1564 in the Editti, V., 60 p. 9, Papal Secret Archives. Concerning the Roman theatre at the time of Pius IV., see Giorn. d. lett. Ital., LXXIII., 296 *seq.*

[3] See *Avviso di Roma of January 13, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 117, Vatican Library). *Cf.* Vol. XVI. of this work.

One particularly thorny point was how to proceed with the carrying out of the severe penalties which the bull of Paul IV. of July 20th, 1558, had decreed against the numerous monks who were living outside their monasteries, or had entered orders which were less strict than their own.[3] A very great number of these unfortunate men appeared before the Pope and asked for pardon, but this request, even with all due regard for mercy, could not be granted without further consideration. Exhaustive discussions followed as to how a middle course could be arrived at, which should avoid both exaggerated severity and too great clemency.[4] It was clear that serious difficulties had arisen in the carrying out of the bull of Paul IV. The monks affected by it were too numerous, and complaints were made that the constitution did not make the necessary distinctions, as many lived outside their monasteries for valid reasons, and with the permission of the Apostolic See and the superiors of their orders. Several, moreover, had shown themselves ready to obey the command of Paul IV., but could not be received back by their former superiors; they therefore lost their means of subsistence and were, by decrees, excluded from the sacraments. Paul IV. had also forbidden by a decree, that anyone should give shelter to an "apostate" monk, but this order could hardly be put into force owing to the great number, and hence arose many difficulties of conscience. Pius IV., therefore, on April 3rd, 1560, absolved all those who, on account of disobedience to the decrees of his predecessor, had fallen under censure or into irregularity, and repealed the decree itself in so far as it went beyond the common law, and at the same time gave extraordinary powers to his Vicar in Rome, Cardinal Savelli, and to the bishops and superiors of orders, to decide in the name of the Pope matters in dispute concerning the "apostates" and those monks who had entered other orders. These were obliged within six months to submit their dispensations to the duly qualified judge and obey his decision.[1]

---

[1] See Acta consist. of January 19, 1560; *cf.* GULIK-EUBEL, 40.

[2] *Cf.* *Avviso di Roma of January 20, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 120, Vatican Library).

[3] See Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 217.

[4] *Cf.* *Avvisi di Roma of January 20, February 24, and March 9, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 120, 128b, 135b, Vatican Library).

It is characteristic of conditions in the Curia that as soon as the pressure exercised by Paul IV. had been removed, the evil elements immediately wakened once more into activity,[2] but if anyone thought that the work of reform had come to a standstill under the new Pope, he was grievously mistaken. Pius IV. declared quite openly that what had been tolerated in the time of Leo X. would no longer be allowed.[3] When he confirmed the election capitulation on January 12th, 1560, he announced his intention of carrying out as Pope the thing that appeared the most necessary to all persons of discernment, namely, the taking seriously in hand of the questions of reform and the Council. He also spoke to the same effect at his first consistory, held on the same day,[4] and announced that a commission for the "reform of morals" would be appointed even before the meeting of the Council. Of this Cardinals Tournon, Carpi, Morone, Madruzzo, Cueva, Saraceni, Puteo, Cicada, Dolera, Savelli, Alessandro Farnese, Santa Fiora,

---

[1] Bullarium Rom., VIII., 15 *seqq*. To the decrees concerning the residence of the bishops, Pius IV. held firmly (*cf*. besides the Acta consist., Papal Secret Archives, the *Avvisi di Roma of January 27, February 10 and 17, and March 9, 1560, Urb. 1039, pp. 122, 127, 128, 132, 135b; see also Chapter IV. *infra*), but with regard to the *Regressi*, on the other hand, he showed considerable indulgence. *Cf*. *Avvisi di Roma of January 13 and 20, February 10, and March 2, 1560 (Urb. 1039, pp. 117, 120, 127, 134, Vatican Library). See also MOCENIGO, 29.

[2] *Avviso di Roma of January 20, 1560: "Roma torna su la pristina libertà. Le puttane cominciano andar in cocchio al solito" (Urb. 1039, p. 120b, Vatican Library). *Cf*. MOCENIGO, 36.

[3] See DEMBIŃSKI, Wybor Piusa IV., 286.

[4] See *Acta consist. Cancell., VIII., 1 (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican). *Cf*. DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 328, and the *report of Ricasoli of January 12, 1560 (State Archives, Florence).

Este and Charles Borromeo were members. They were to meet every Thursday, and to prepare important changes in the Papal tribunals and the conclave. The bishops who were lingering at the curia were called upon to fulfil their duty of residence,[1] and immediately afterwards three Cardinals received orders to take steps to provide Rome with grain.[2]

To the great joy of the Curia, Pius IV. also showed his love of peace in the most unequivocal manner,[3] promised to provide for strict justice, willingly granted audiences to all, discharged business quickly and skilfully, and displayed, in addition, great activity in building.[4] A bull of May 15th, 1560, graciously forgave the Romans for the excesses of which they had been guilty at the time of the death of Paul IV.,[5] and the city of Rome, which had suffered so much under the Carafa Pope, improved in a remarkable manner, both with regard to its prosperity, and also in the number of its inhabitants, which rose in 1563 to 80,000. The Venetian ambassador, Girolamo Soranzo, describes Rome at this time as the most beautiful city of the Appenine peninsula, and praised its international character, which had nearly disappeared under Paul IV.[1] An intimate friend of Cardinal Santa Fiora gave, on October 25th, 1561, in a letter to Vincenzo Gonzaga, an enthusiastic description of Rome under the new pontificate: "The city is unfolding itself in its fullest beauty. The Pope promised at the beginning of his reign to protect religion, peace, and justice, and to provide for the material needs of his capital, and he has kept his word. Rome has a superabundance of grain, wine, and other necessaries, and the feeling of general contentment is universal. Persons of good conduct and talent are highly esteemed, and worthless characters have either to change their ways or submit to punishment, if they do not prefer to go, of their own accord, into banishment. Perfect peace prevails in public, as in private life. The Pope promotes the affair of the Council by every possible means, and knows how to combine clemency with justice."[2]

---

[1] Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 343, without exact date. An *Avviso di Roma of February 10, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 127 Vatican Library) tells of the appointment of the "congregatione generale per la reformatione generale," which Arco announces as impending on January 31, 1560 (SICKEL, Konzil, 26). According to MASSARELLI, 349, the sessions of this congregation took place in September, 1560, every Sunday in the presence of the Pope. *Cf.* EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 2.

[2] *Avviso di Roma of February 10, 1560 (*loc. cit.*, Vatican Library). *Cf.* BENIGNI, 35 *seq.*, and CUPIS, 147 *seq.*

[3] When the general in command of the infantry, Torquato Conti, was granted an audience on the occasion of his appointment, the Pope said to him that he would like to reward him,* "ma ch' il non vuole ne soldati ne guerra, ma vuole che li contadini attendino a cultivare li terreni per il ben di tutti" (Avviso, Urb. 1039, p. 114b, Vatican Library). *Cf.* MOCENIGO, 51.

[4] *Cf.* Arch. stor. Napolit., I., 648. Concerning the rapid transaction of business in the Signatura, Ricasoli *reports as early as January 13, 1560, (State Archives, Florence).

[5] The bull is to be found in the *Editti in the Papal Secret Archives.

As a matter of fact, Pius IV. did indeed temper with mildness the severity of his predecessor, in all cases where it was possible. Only in the matter of the Carafa family did he go far beyond what had been done by Paul IV.

---

[1] GIROL. SORANZO, 83 *seq.*

[2] Letter of Aurelio Porcelaga in the Lett. de' princ., I., 231 *seq.* *Cf.* CIACONIUS, III., 385, and also the letter of Paulus Manutius to J. B. Titius, of December 5, 1561, in the *Epist. P. Manutii*, 344 *seq.*, Venice, 1573. An example of the severity shown in the administration of justice at the beginning of the reign in the *Avviso di Roma of July 5, 1561: This day "impiccati 14 per capparuoli et homicidi," and "circa 25 mandati in galea: così si va purgando la terra id malfattori" (Urb. 1039, p. 285, Vatican Library). Soon, however, rich people could purchase their freedom by money (MOCENIGO, 30). This increased later on and led to grave evils (see P. TIEPOLO, 174).

CHAPTER IV

THE FALL OF THE HOUSE OF CARAFA

WHEN, in January, 1559, the sudden fall of the nephews of Paul IV. took place, the Pope had expressed the hope that his successor would punish the guilty in a fitting manner. There seemed, at first, but little prospect of his hope being realized, as Cardinal Carlo Carafa succeeded after the death of Paul IV. in again immediately gaining a firm footing in the Sacred College. The fierce anger of his enemies stood him in good stead in this respect, for even those who, like Cardinal Pacheco, were by no means friendly to the Carafa, blamed the wild excesses of the Romans, against which the Sacred College was bound, in its own interests, to make a stand.

The Romans understood these feelings very well, and although they were resolved upon the banishment of the secular nephews of Paul IV., they did not dare to proceed in a like manner against the two Cardinals, Carlo and Alfonso Carafa.[1] The request of the Roman people to be allowed to drive the Duke of Paliano, Giovanni Carafa, out of the States of the Church, was unanimously rejected by the Sacred College.[2] The shrewd attitude taken up by Cardinal Carlo Carafa had not been without its influence upon this refusal. He declared, before the Cardinals, that if it were for the good of the Church, not only his brother, but also he himself and Cardinal Alfonso would leave Rome; they were prepared to sacrifice their own personal interests to the public good; but if it were a mere question of satisfying hatred, the Cardinals would do well to consider what such a compliance with the fury of the populace would entail. In the election capitulation, the Cardinals had later expressly resolved that the new Pope should severely punish the excesses committed during the vacancy in the Papal throne.[1]

---

[1] See *supra* p. 4.

[2] See *supra* p. 5,

Although the influence of Cardinal Carlo was evident in these decisions, there could yet be no doubt as to the continued activity of the former enemies of the family; should these gain the upper hand in the conclave, then a fresh exile, and perhaps worse, was to be feared. Fully aware of the threatened danger, Cardinal Carlo Carafa did his utmost in the negotiations concerning the Papal election to gain a decisive influence in the elevation of the new head of the Church. The manner in which he set about this shows that he had learned nothing during his exile. With incredible arrogance, he again displayed his consciousness of his former power, and with utter want of consideration treated his colleagues as if they had been his servants.[2] He made use of every possible means to make his position in the conclave appear to be decisive, and to make use of it in the interests of his family. It cannot, indeed, be maintained that he was prepared to elevate one who was thoroughly incapable to the Papal throne, for his candidates, Carpi, Pacheco, Dolera and Gonzaga, were worthy men, but in other respects he adopted in the conclave a policy merely conducive to his own interests. Although formerly his sympathies had been on the side of the French, he now declared himself for the candidate of the Spaniards, from whom alone he could expect a great reward for his family. When Philip II., by restoring Paliano to its former possessor, did not seem to appreciate his services, he declared himself neutral, probably so as to let the Spaniards feel his importance, and had, in fact, the satisfaction of seeing both French and Spaniards alternately flattering and wooing him, and of standing out as the arbiter of the conclave. He again turned to the Spaniards on the strength of the promises made to him by the Spanish ambassador, Vargas, thereby breaking his word to the French without scruple, and frustrating the already far advanced candidature of Gonzaga.

---

[1] See DEMBIŃSKI, Wybór Piusa IV., 302. *Cf. supra* p. 16.

[2] See *infra* p. 158, n. 2, the *report of Fr. Tonina of January 15, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

It was a severe blow to him when his attempt on behalf of Carpi, made at the same time, was a failure, for, as Bernardino Pia informs us, Carafa knew well that his cause was lost if this candidature, for the sake of which he had made so many enemies, did not succeed.[1] There remained, indeed, no other course for him but to declare himself for Medici, whose election he had hitherto opposed. This change, which was by no means voluntary on his part, had been effected by means of promises which gave Carafa reason to hope that the new Pope would support his interests in the matter of Paliano, and induce Philip II., at any rate, to keep the fortress in a state of sequestration until such time as a suitable indemnity could be arranged.[2]

Although Pius IV. clearly understood that the participation of Carafa in his election had been neither voluntary nor disinterested, he nevertheless gave him credit for the great services he had rendered him, and showed his gratitude in various ways. At the end of December, 1559, the envoy sent to Spain was a declared adherent of the Carafa, and had instructions to work diligently to obtain compensation for Paliano.[3] Cardinal Carafa had all the more reason to look for a happy issue to this affair, as Vargas, the representative of Philip II. in Rome, was altogether on his side, and urgently represented to his master how greatly it was to his own interests to fulfil the expectations of Carafa.[1] Duke Cosimo I. of Florence, who had made binding promises to Carafa during the conclave,[2] was also active in the same sense. The enormous importance of the attitude taken up by the Spanish king, not only with regard to Paliano, but also for the whole future of his family, could not fail to be understood by so experienced a politician as Carlo Carafa. He therefore caused a special envoy, in the person of Oliviero Sesso, to be sent to the court at Toledo, at the beginning of January, 1560, who was to remind Philip II., in the most discreet manner, of the great services which Cardinal Carafa had rendered to the Spanish cause during the Papal election.[3] How great was the desire of Pius IV., at the beginning of March, 1560, that the question of compensation for Paliano should be settled in a sense favourable to the Carafa, is clear from the instructions given to the new nuncio, Ottaviano Raverta, then starting for Spain.[4]

---

[1] See Pia's letter of December 15, 1550, in ANCEL, Disgrâce, 70, n. 2.

[2] See MÜLLER, 223 *seq.* *Cf. supra* p. 57.

[3] See the report of Vargas of December 29, 1559, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 326 *seq.* *Cf.* the *brief to F. a Sanguine, dated Rome, January 5, 1560, in which Pius IV. emphasizes how much he has the commission of Sanguine at heart (magnae merito nobis curae sunt) and that the King should grant his first request (Arm. 44, t. 19, n. 17 n., Papal Secret Archives). *Cf.* HINIJOSA, 120.

---

[1] Besides Vargas' report mentioned *supra* p. 133, n. 3, *cf.* his *instructions for Ascanio Caracciolo (January 1, 1560) who was returning to Spain (Simancas Archives). *Cf.* ANCEL, Disgrâce, 72.

[2] See ANCEL, *loc. cit.*

[3] See *Istrurione data dal card. Carafa al conte Olivieri espedito al Re cattolico dopo la creazione di Pio IV. (s.d.), Barb., 5674, p. 162, Vatican Library, used by ANCEL, Disgrâce, 73.

[4] There we read: *" Desiderando levar tutte le occasioni che possano in alcuna maniera adombrare la serenità degli animi di N. Sig^{re} e di S. M^{ta} et che tutta la benvolenza et ottima corrispondenza d' animo si conservi et accreschi, mi conviene per espressa commissione di Sua Beat^{ne} far sapere a S. M^{ta} che ha risoluto per ogni modo che Paliano si smantelli, conforme a l' obligo della capitulatione, et che l' artiglieria et munitione della Sede Apostolica si restituisca. Nel qual proposito non mancherete di far futta quella instanza a nome di S. Beat^{ne} che potrete maggiore, acciò si adempisca la ricompensa promessa a li signori Carafi, intendendo prima dal sig Fabritio di Sangro in che termini lui haberà condutto il detto negotio. Et sopra tutto raccomandate la persona et gli interessi di monsignore ill^{mo} Carafa, quale N. Sig^{re} ama teneramente et, come V.S. sa, ha causa d' amarlo." . . . Di Roma a XI. di marzo 1560. Varia polit. CXVII. (formerly CXVI), 380-1, Papal Secret Archives.

While, at the beginning of the pontificate of Pius IV., a prosperous future seemed to be dawning for the nephews of his predecessor, a storm was slowly gathering over their heads, which was destined to overwhelm them.

The despotism which the Carafa had exercised in Rome during the period of their unlimited influence over Paul IV., had given rise in all quarters to the greatest bitterness and hatred against them. Among the numerous enemies whom the Carafa had made for themselves, many were persons of the greatest influence, who did everything in their power to turn the new Pope against them. The most important of these were Marcantonio Colonna, and the all-powerful Cardinal Camerlengo, Guido Antonio Sforza of Santa Fiora. Both had been deeply offended and gravely injured by the Carafa under Paul IV. In the case of Santa Fiora, the official representative of the interests of Philip II., he was not only actuated by feelings of revenge, but also by the knowledge that the protégé of the Spanish king, Marcantonio Colonna, could only gain possession of his strongholds by the destruction of the Carafa.[1]

Cardinal Carafa had also made a very bitter enemy of Ercole Gonzaga by his disloyal behaviour in the conclave. Unfortunately for Carlo Carafa, Gonzaga and his friends, among whom was the powerful Cardinal Madruzzo of Trent, had won great influence in the Curia at the very beginning of the reign of Pius IV., through the union of their families with that of the Pope.[2] While Madruzzo was endeavouring to secure Gallese and Soriano for the Altemps, Ercole Gonzaga was seeking, as early as January, 1560, to pave the way for himself to the supreme dignity. The Carafa stood in the way of both of them,[3] and both, therefore, brought strong pressure to bear upon Pius IV. to turn him against the nephews of Paul IV. Complaints against that family were all the more readily believed by the new Pope, as he had belonged to the opposition party during the pontificate of

---

[1] *Cf.* ANCEL, Disgrâce, 76 *seq.*

[2] *Cf. supra* p.p. 99, 104.

[3] *Cf.* MÜLLER, 267 *seq.*, and ANCEL, 79 *seq.*

Paul IV., which had been fully aware of the faults and blunders of the government, and had sharply criticized them. The contrast to his predecessor's method of government had already been so plainly shown by the new Pope in other respects, that one might describe it as a reaction against the pontificate of Paul IV. From this reaction the Carafa, who had to bear so much of the blame for the mistakes of their uncle, could scarcely hope to be spared, and it is, therefore, no wonder that even at the beginning of 1560, their position threatened to become one of danger.

Their former guilt was still further increased by a tragic event which had taken place before the election of Pius IV. Giovanni Carafa, Duke of Paliano, a man who was easily roused to anger, and in his rage lost all control of himself, had led a brilliant, extravagant and unrestrained life when he had been at the height of his power. In spite of his own unfaithfulness he loved his wife, the beautiful, gifted and cultured Violante d'Alife, who had borne him three children. She was not unaware of the immoral life led by her husband. After the fall of the Pope's nephews, the Duke had betaken himself, with Violante, to their possessions on the northern side of the Ciminian hills, between Viterbo and Civita Castellana, where they resided in the castles of Gallese and Soriano. In that lonely neighbourhood, the rugged character of which makes a deep impression on the visitor, an event took place during the summer of 1559, while Paul IV. was still alive, which was not altogether cleared up even during the proceedings which took place later on.[1]

---

[1] The older accounts of the death of the Duchess of Paliano (DE STENDHAL [Beyle), in the Revue des deux mondes, 1838; REUMONT, Beiträge, I., 483 *seq.*), were superseded by the work of GNOLI concerning Violante Carafa in the Nuova Antologia, XIX. (1872), 341 *seqq.*, 543 *seqq.*, 799 *seqq.* Besides this there are the documents used by GORI in his Archivio, I., 245 *seq.*; II., 45 *seqq.*; 200 *seqq.*; 257 *seqq.*; which were considerably added to by ANCEL (Disgrâce, 59 *seqq.*). It has not been proved for certain that the Duchess was guilty of adultery, nor do we know what was the attitude of Paul IV., at that time on his death-bed,

The following facts may, however, be taken as certain: in the July of that year, tales were brought to the Duke of Paliano to the effect that his wife was carrying on illicit relations with one of the members of her household, the handsome and talented Neapolitan, Marcello Capece. The Duke was all the more ready to become suspicious and jealous as he knew himself to be guilty of a similar want of fidelity. He gave credence to the guilt of Capece and his wife, and took a bloody revenge upon both of them. Capece was taken to the dungeons of the fortress of Soriano, while the Duchess was strictly guarded in the castle of Gallese. The jealousy of the Duke was still further inflamed by the false ideas of honour then common among the nobles, which taught that the adultery of a wife brought such a stain upon the family as could only be washed out in the blood of the guilty parties. Giovanni Carafa was strengthened in this view, not only by his brother, Cardinal Carlo, but also by his brother-in-law. Justifying himself on his right, as feudal lord of his subjects, to judge and punish them without restraint, he set up a secret criminal court, of which he himself, the brother of the Duchess, Ferrante, Count d'Alife, her uncle, Lionardo di Cardine, and a third relative, Gian Antonio Toralto, were the members. The investigation, if one can call it such, took place in secret, completely ignoring all legal forms, without witnesses, defence or notary. The court was held in the strong old fortress of the Orsini, which stands high above the little town of Soriano. An admission was drawn from Capece under torture that he had enjoyed the favour of the Duchess; the Duke, thereupon, seized with ungovernable fury, stabbed him on the spot, during the night between July 26th and 27th, 1559. In consequence of the excitement, and the persistent pressure of his relatives, to cleanse still further the supposedly besmirched honour of the family, by the blood of the Duchess, the enraged man fell ill, and

with regard to the matter (ANCEL, 61 n. 1). RIESS (p. 378) and PARISIO (Arch. Napolit., XII., 838 *seq.*) consider the Duchess guilty, without taking into consideration the weighty arguments to the contrary brought forward by GNOLI (*loc. cit.*, 814 *seq.*).

although the Duchess was with child, he offered but a feeble resistance to their will. The Count d'Alife undertook to strangle his sister with his own hands, and on August 29th, 1559, he appeared with Lionardo di Cardine and a band of armed retainers at Gallese. They had brought two priests with them from the Capuchin convent there, who were to prepare the unhappy victim for death. The Capuchins begged in vain for a delay in carrying out the deed, in view of the condition of the Duchess, but the Count answered that he had to go to Rome, and that he could not show himself there with this brand upon his brow. Violante was resigned to her fate; she confessed and communicated, and protested her innocence with her dying breath.

This event would have caused a still greater sensation had it not taken place during the troubled days of the vacancy in the Papal throne, eleven days after the death of Paul IV. Nevertheless, the enemies of the Carafa took good care that it was not forgotten. A report from Rome on January 6th, 1560, announces that the Duke of Paliano had arrived at the last post station before Rome, at La Storta, where he had conferred for three hours with his brother, the Cardinal; "he did not dare to enter the city, for his case looked bad." A second report, of January 13th, relates that the Duke had begged for mercy from the Pope, but that the latter intended to proceed against the murderers.[1] Pius IV. did not hurry matters, and it was only at the end of March that clear-sighted observers were able to detect signs that a criminal suit against the Carafa was impending.

This decision was certainly not an easy one for Pius IV., "but if only to secure order he had no choice but to bring the haughty nephews of Paul IV. to submission."[2] He at first set to work with great caution. Girolamo de Federicis and Alessandro Pallantieri were reinstated on March 27th, 1560, in the positions of which they had been deprived by Paul IV.; the former was again appointed Governor of Rome, and the latter Procurator-Fiscal.[1] Pius IV. issued a decree on April 3rd, probably on the advice of Pallantieri, which renewed severe penalties against those who had usurped Church property.[2] This measure was connected with certain accusations which had been made against Cardinal Alfonso Carafa, that he had used his influence during the illness of Paul IV. to induce the Pope to give him presents. In the meantime Pallantieri was hard at work so that the excesses of the other members of the family should not remain unpunished, and the time now seemed to have come when he would be able to take revenge for his deposition, and his more than two years' imprisonment in the Castle of St. Angelo. An enterprising and vindictive man, like this experienced lawyer, was the most suitable person to collect from all sources proofs of the excesses of the Carafa. Their creditors were next set in motion, and immediately began to assail the Pope with their complaints. At the beginning of April Pius IV. informed Cardinals Carlo and Alfonso Carafa that he must insist on their satisfying their creditors, whereupon both the Cardinals betook themselves to Gallese to discuss with the Duke of Paliano how this was to be effected.[3] A short time afterwards Cardinal Alfonso was called to account, in virtue of the decree of April 3rd. He declared that he had received a casket of jewels from the dying Pope as a present, and that this had been effected by means of a brief. The latter was dated on the day of the death of Paul IV., and the enemies of the Carafa said that it was an extortion which must be made good. Pius IV. ordered that it must be clearly shown how the casket came into the Cardinal's possession, as the brief did not appear to be very authentic, and it was already reported that the Pope would decide the dispute between Alfonso Carafa and the Cardinal Camerlengo in favour of the latter.[4]

---

[1] See *Avvisi di Roma of January 6 and 13, 1560 (Urb. 1039, pp. 114b, 117, Vatican Library).

[2] Opinion of BENRATH in Herzogs Realenzyklopädie, XV., 437.

---

[1] See ANCEL, Disgrâce, 81.

[2] Bull. Rom., VII., 18 *seq.* The date given by ANCEL (p. 83) viz. April 2, is erroneous.

[3] *Avviso di Roma of April 6, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 145b. Vatican Library).

[4] *Avvisi di Roma of April 13 and 27, 1560, *ibid.*, pp. 149, 151b.

In this state of affairs a great deal depended upon the attitude of the King of Spain, and he could not think of putting the interests of the Carafa before those of Marcantonio Colonna, who was entirely devoted to him. Nor was this the only thing to be considered. According to the principle that unreliable confederates and dangerous opponents should be destroyed while there was yet time, the suppression and, if possible, the destruction of the family which had brought about such a severe struggle with the Holy See under Paul IV., seemed to him to be the policy to be followed.[1] Fabrizio di Sangro and Ottaviano Raverta received undecisive answers, which showed plainly enough that the Spanish king paid much more attention to the advice of Cardinal Santa Fiora than to that of Francisco Vargas.[2] When the Count of Tendilla,[3] the ambassador extraordinary of Philip II., arrived in Rome on May 12th, for the *obedientia* ceremony, the true state of the king's mind was seen even more clearly. In contrast to Vargas, who still worked for the Carafa with undiminished zeal, Tendilla displayed a marked indifference towards the nephews of Paul IV. He had at first taken up his residence at the Spanish embassy with Vargas, but afterwards, at the express wish of the Pope, removed to the Belvedere.[4] There he repeatedly had secret conferences with

---

[1] This is justly pointed out by HILLIGER, p. 15.

[2] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 14, 15, 5 *seq.*; DURUY, 410 *seq.* ANCEL, Disgrâce, 83 *seq.*; RIESS, 309 *seq.*

[3] Alba would have liked his son sent to Rome as ambassador. Had he succeeded in this the enmity of the Duke for the Carafa would have been very disadvantageous to that family, as Giulio Grandi points out in his *report of March 13, 1560 (State Archives, Modena). Tendilla proved, indeed, just as great an opponent of the Carafa; it was evident that he was acquainted with the secret intentions of Philip II. Concerning Tendilla *cf.* CONSTANT, Rapport, 276 *seq*

[4] *Cf.* Vargas' *reports of May 15 and 20, 1560, used by ANCEL, Disgrâce, 84. The *Avvisi di Roma of May 17 and 21, announce that Tendilla was "allogiato a spese di S.S^{ta} in Belvedere con infinite carezze" (Urb. 1039, p. 158b, Vatican Library). Con-

Pius IV., and shrewd observers were quick to conclude that negotiations prejudical to the Carafa were taking place.[1] There can, indeed, be no doubt that not only the enemies of the Carafa in Rome, but Philip II. as well, were at that time inciting the Pope[2] to take decisive steps against the nephews of Paul IV., and that their efforts were meeting with success. Pius IV., however, was careful not to let his altered frame of mind appear, and he explained this later on by saying that he wished to prevent the flight of the Carafa. The latter were able, therefore, to lull themselves with a false sense of security, indeed, their confidence was so complete that they even dared to challenge their enemies, for it can only be so described when the Duke of Paliano commenced a law-suit in Gallese against Marcantonio Colonna on the ground of an alleged attempt at poisoning him. Pius IV. appeared to give sanction to this proceeding by ordering a commissary to go to Gallese.[3]

Cardinal Carafa had not the slightest idea at the beginning of June how near his enemies were to attaining their end, although the altered state of affairs did not escape the notice of the diplomatists. That keen observer, the Venetian ambassador, informed the Doge at that time that Tendilla was always conferring in secret with the Pope, without the knowledge of Vargas or the Spanish Cardinals, concerning the matter of compensation for Paliano, a question which was developing to the disadvantage of the Carafa; that Marcantonio was successfully arranging his sister's marriage with Annibale Altemps, and that Colonna's mother was shortly returning to Rome. To this was added the fateful news that Vargas, the friend of the Carafa, was not in favour

---

cerning the *obedientia* ceremony on May 16, 1560, see *Acta consist. Cam., IX., 21, in the Consistorial Archives of the Vatican, *reports of Mula and Mocenigo of May 20, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna), and Boss, 66.

[1] *Cf.* ANCEL, Disgrâce, 85 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* HILLIGER, 15.

[3] *Cf.* ANCEL, Disgrâce, 88, who justly dismisses the statements of Duruy (p. 318) as fanciful.

with the Pope nor at the Curia.[1] The Florentine ambassador announces at the same time the great zeal shown by Pallantieri in collecting evidence against the Carafa, "As the Imperialists," he adds, "show neither in deeds nor in words any consideration for Cardinal Carafa, one cannot but fear for his future."[2]

The Cardinal himself feared nothing. He was fully persuaded that the Pope would arrange that he should be fully compensated, for he owed to him his election. Cardinal Carafa, announces Mula, rejoices that Philip II. lent no willing ear to his enemies; he dined with Borromeo on June 3rd, and appears in very good spirits.[3]

Cardinal Carlo Carafa's answer to his brother Giovanni, dated June 1st, when he had consulted him about his return to Rome, also expresses great confidence. In this letter the Cardinal thinks that although Philip II. has given no decisive answer, they may nevertheless hope that the matter of compensation will be satisfactorily settled, all the more because the Pope shows the greatest desire for this; the Duke is quite at liberty to come to Rome.[4]

The feeling of confidence entertained by Cardinal Carafa was not even shaken when Pius IV., after the arrest on May 27th of Cardinal del Monte, who had stained his purple with blood, made the remark: "We have not yet come to the end."[5] This hint inspired Cardinal Carafa with as little fear as the fact that the old enemy of his house, Giovanna d'Aragona Colonna, who had been obliged to fly in disguise from Rome four years before, now made a triumphal entry into the city, many of the Romans, including the guard and the relatives of the Pope, going to meet her. On the following day she had an audience of ceremony.[1]

---

[1] **Letter of June 1, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna).

[2] *Letter of G. B. Ricasoli to Cosimo I. of May 30, 1560 (State Archives, Florence), translated in ANCEL, Disgrâce, 82. On June 1, 1560, Ricasoli *announces that Gabrio Serbelloni has told him: "che il papa è stato come resoluto quando fù carcerato Monte di darli *Carafa in compagnia* et che di questo era certo, ma di poi *a intercessione non sa di chi* li pare si *sia poi mutato*" (that in italics is in cypher). State Archives, Florence.

[3] **Report of Mula of June 7, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna).

[4] See the actual text of the letter (Papal Secret Archives) in Appendix No. 4.

[5] See the *reports of the Florentine ambassador of May 30 and June 6, 1560 (State Archives, Florence). *Cf.* ANCEL, Disgrâce,

On June 6th the Duke of Paliano also returned to Rome. In consequence of favourable news from Spain both he and his brother the Cardinal were in the best of spirits; in the evening they amused themselves with music and dancing in the company of loose women.[2]

A secret consistory had been arranged to take place in the Vatican on the morning of June 7th.[3] This was held in the apartment situated between the Appartimento Borgia and the Sala Ducale, which is now called the Sala Guardaroba. The Cardinals were awaiting the appearance of the Pope when Aurelio Spina, a chamberlain of Cardinal Borromeo,

---

89 *seq.* The arrest of del Monte, according to Massarelli, in MERKLE, II., 345, was "ob duo homicidia suis manibus perpetrata in civitate Nucerina in Umbria, in personam scilicet patris et filii ibi magistri cursorum, dum sede vacante Pauli IV. ex Venetiis Urbem citatis equis reverteretur." See also Mula's *reports of May 27, June 1, and July 20, 1560. *Cf.* further the *Avvisi di Roma of June 1, 15, and 29 (Urb. 1039, pp. 162, 169, 176, Vatican Library) and Mula's *reports of May 27 and 31, and June 1, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna).

[1] See the *report of G. B. Ricasoli of June 5, 1560, State Archives Florence. *Avviso di Roma of June 8, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 165a, Vatican Library). MASSARELLI, 346. Concerning the flight of Giovanna, see Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 111.

[2] See in Appendix No. 7, the *Avviso di Roma of June 8, 1560 (Vatican Library).

[3] See for what follows, Ricasoli's *report of June 7, 1560, in Appendix No. 6. *Cf.* *Acta consist. Cancell., VIII, 38, and *Acta consist. Cam., IX., 22b (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican, Appendix No. 5) further MASSARELLI, 346; BONDONUS, 534 *seq.*; the report of the Portuguese ambassador of June 12, 1560 in the Corpo. dipl. Portug., VIII., 470, *seq.*: POGIANI Epist., II., 220; correspondence of Card. O. Truchsess, 172 *seq.*

announced to Cardinal Carafa that His Holiness wished to speak to him. The Cardinal, in joyful expectation, followed the chamberlain by a secret staircase to the Papal Hall of Audience, where the groom of the chambers then on duty requested him to wait. Soon afterwards Cardinal Alfonso Carafa also arrived, whereupon the Captain of the Papal Guard, Gabrio Serbelloni, appeared, and announced that they were both under arrest. While Alfonso obeyed in silence, Carlo cried out boldly: "This is the reward for my valuable services!" Both Cardinals were at once conducted by the secret passage to the Castle of St. Angelo.

The Governor of Rome and the Procurator-Fiscal proceeded at the same time, accompanied by numerous police, to the Palazzo Carafa in the Piazza Navona, where they presented the Duke of Paliano with a warrant for his arrest, and then took him also to the Castle of St. Angelo. The same morning similar treatment was given to all the intimates and particular friends of the two Cardinals. Among the associates of Carlo, this fate befell Cesare Brancaccio, his secretary, Urbino, his majordomo and four of his attendants, whilst among the intimates of Cardinal Alfonso, his secretary, Paolo Filonardo, and three other members of his household were arrested. The Count d'Alife and Lionardo di Cardine also fell into the hands of the police, but some few, such as the Bishop of Civita di Penna, Vico de'Nobili, and Matteo Stendardi, succeeded in escaping. The Marquis of Montebello was in Naples at the time. After the arrests, all the papers of the Carafa, even the ordinary housekeeping books, were seized; they filled seven or eight chests.

When the Florentine ambassador brought the news of the arrest of their two colleagues, of which he had been a witness, to the Cardinals assembled in the Hall of Consistories, there at once arose a murmuring and whispering, while astonishment and fear took possession of all present. Several, like Cardinal Vitelli, endeavoured to conceal their dismay, but Este and others did not hide their displeasure. When Pius IV. at last appeared, it could clearly be seen from his expression how pleased he was that the affair had succeeded so well. The communication which he made to the Cardinals concerning what had taken place, was limited to a bare statement of facts. On the following day, however, he was all the more communicative to the ambassadors, Vargas and Tendilla, who had been invited to dine with him, the case being discussed both before and after the meal. The Pope set forth the crimes of the nephews of Paul IV. in great detail, laying special stress on their scandalous and unjust attempt to stir up strife against Charles V. The two Spanish ambassadors were invited to convince themselves, by an examination of the documents, of the falsity of the accusations made at the time, especially of the intrigues set on foot by Cardinal Carafa, and of the purely imaginary plot of the Imperialists to poison Paul IV., by means of which the Pope was incited to break with Spain. The Pope also laid stress on the fact that Cardinal Carafa had, besides all this, been guilty of numerous murders, violations and other crimes; that Cardinal Alfonso had obtained possession of money and valuables at the time of the death of Paul IV. by means of forged briefs; that the Duke of Paliano had committed atrocities, robberies and acts of injustice of every kind during his uncle's reign, and had murdered his wife during the vacancy in the Holy See. Such crimes must not remain unpunished.[1] Pius IV. expressed himself in a like manner to the Venetian and Florentine ambassadors.[2]

The greater number of the Cardinals disapproved of the strong measures adopted by the Pope against two members of the Sacred College, from a feeling of *esprit de corps*. Carpi, Este, and Farnese[3] were the most outspoken in expressing their displeasure, and on various grounds. They, however, were almost alone in taking up this attitude. The Roman people, for the most part, were of opinion that, in view of the undoubted guilt of the Carafa, the Pope was thoroughly justified in proceeding thus severely against them; there was a feeling of universal joy that at last punishment was to overtake the family. The Carafa, writes Cardinal Truchsess,[1] have many accusers, but few defenders. Cardinal Alfonso, whom most people considered innocent, was the only one to receive any sympathy, but the Romans were so filled with hatred for the other members of the family that they wished to light a bonfire on the Capitol, but this the Pope forbade.[2] Outside the Eternal City, also, people learned with pleasure of the proceedings of Pius IV. against the Carafa. In strictly religious circles, people saw in their imprisonment a well-deserved punishment from heaven for the grave injury they had inflicted on the Church.[3]

---

[1] The *reports of Vargas and Tendilla of June 10, 1560, which are not given in Döllinger, are in the Simancas Archives, and are used by ANCEL, Disgrâce, 91 *seq.*

[2] See the *report of Mula of June 8 (State Archives, Venice), and that of Ricasoli of June 10, 1560 (State Archives, Florence). *Cf.* ANCEL, 92.

[3] *Questa cattura di sig. Carafa più che a tutti gli altri rev^{mi} per varie ragioni è dispiaciuta a Carpi, Ferrara et Farnese. *Report of G. B. Ricasoli of June 8, 1560 (State Archives, Florence).

---

[1] Besides Ricasoli's *report of June 7, 1560 (see ANCEL, Disgrâce, 91) *cf.* also the *Avviso di Roma of June 8, which states: "Pochi sono che non se rallegrino della prigionia delli Caraffi, massimamente il populo Romano, già di loro tanto offeso" (Urb. 1039, Vatican Library). See also the letter of Camillo Borromeo in the Arch. stor. Lomb., XIX. (1903). 357 n. and that of G. Salvago in the Atti Lig., XIII, 763, as well as the correspondence of Card. O. Truchsess, 172-3.

[2] Giovan Maria Gonzaga writes on June 8 from Rome to the Duke of Mantua: *In cambio di far card^{li} hieri S.Sta mandò Caraffa et Napoli in castello, et questo fu anche in cambio de fare concistorio dove erano venuti; medemamente vi fu menato il ducha de Paliano et quale era in case de Caraffa et vi era venuto soramente et senza salvo condotto. Molti signori et dependenti di questi sig^{ri} Caraffi sono stati posti pregione. Hanno scritto tutte le robe de li dui rev^{mi}, et si dice che in casa de Napoli vi era una gran quantità de gioie et da vinti millia scudi. La presa di Caraffa è piaciuta a tutti generalmente et maxime alli Romani, quali se non le fusse stato vietato da S. S^{ta} volevano far fuochi in Campidoglio per demostracione de l'alegrezza. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] See Seripando in MERKLE, II., 460.

The legal proceedings against the prisoners were entrusted to Girolamo de Federicis as Governor of Rome, and to the Procurator-Fiscal, Alessandro Pallantieri. Both were declared enemies of the Carafa, and they immediately set to work with the greatest zeal. Investigations were carried on not only in Rome, but also at Gallese and Naples; in the latter city, two chests of documents, which Cardinal Carafa had hidden there, were seized.[1]

The opening of the arraignment, which was based upon an examination of the material that had been collected, took place, by means of a Papal Motu Proprio, on July 1st;[2] a second Motu Proprio, that of July 5th, ordered that Cardinals Cesi, Cueva, Saraceni, Puteo, Cicada, Bertrand, Urbino and Cornaro should be present at the special inquiry and trial of the accused Cardinals, to watch over the proceedings, and to see that the proper judicial forms were observed.[3] The inquiry itself was to be entirely in the hands of Federicis and Pallantieri. The notary associated with them was Luys de Torres, a Spaniard of the confraternity of S. Girolamo della Carità, who had the interests of the accused at heart.[4]

The principal crimes to be laid to the charge of the Duke of Paliano were the murders of Capece and the Duchess, while Cardinals Carlo and Alfonso were accused of having promoted the cruel proceedings against Violante by consent or incitement. Cardinal Carlo was also accused of several murders which belonged in part to the time of his life as a soldier, but above all, of having, while he was the director of the policy of Paul IV., induced that Pope, as well as France, by means of falsehood and deceit, to wage the unhappy war against Spain. All three accused were also charged with having been guilty of great frauds in the administration of the States of the Church. Carlo and the Duke would also have to answer for grave misuse of their authority, especially in the administration of justice, and Cardinal Alfonso for unlawful personal enrichment at the time of the death of Paul IV.

---

[1] *Cf.* Raynaldus, 1560, n. 97; Ancel, Secrétairerie, 40, Disgrâce, 92 *seq.*, and Nonciat. de France, I., viii.

[2] See the *original text in the Papal Secret Archives in Appendix No. 8.

[3] *Motu Proprio 'Nuper' ven. fratri Hieronymo episc. Sagonensi, dated July 5, 1560 (Lib. iur., 493, Papal Secret Archives). *Cf.* Ancel, Disgrâce, 96 *seq.* An *Avviso di Roma of October 19, 1560, states: "Il card. Carafa ha dimandato per suo giudice il card. Borromeo havendo per sospetto il governatore et fiscale" (Urb. 1039, p. 211, Vatican Library).

[4] Ancel, Disgrâce, 97.

The trial of the accused began in the Castle of St. Angelo on July 8th, and lasted for fully three months.[1] While

---

[1] The original documents of the proceedings against the Carafa were burned after having been revised by Pius V. (detailed account in a future volume of this work). No copies are in existence. A summary, however, prepared under Pius V., has been preserved under the title of *Scripta varia in causa card. Carafa [e] in the Papal Secret Archives, Miscell. XI., 114 (copies: Vatic., 7450, Barb. lat., 5752, and one in the Library at Cortona). Besides these there is the *Liber iurium coram r^{mo} gubernatore . . . contra ill. et r^{mos} dom. card. Carolum Carafam, Alphonsum Neapolit., Leonardum de Cardine. Ferrant. Garlonium et complices, Papal Secret Archives, Miscell. X., 197 (imperfect copies in the State Archives, Rome), which contains the originals of the compromising documents which were seized by order of Pius IV., and were used in formulating the accusation. The *Lettere repetite pro parte card. Caraffe in eius causa contra Fiscum are in the Cod. Ottob., 2348, p. 286-427, the *Acta of the defenders of the Carafa and their records are preserved in the Papal Secret Archives at the end of the Codex Miscell., XI., 114, *ibid.* in Codex I. 130, pp. 15-29 of the Fonds Borghese (Scritture dello studio del s^{or} Marc Antonio Borghese sulla causa Romana excessum a difesa delli cardinali Carlo et Alfonso Carafa e del duca di Paliano) and in the Barb. lat., 3630 (Papers for the defence of Cardinal Alfonso Carafa).—*Cf.* ANCEL, Secrét., 41 *seq.* and Disgrâce, 3-11, and Nonciat. de France, I., x *seq.* Ancel was the first to give a complete survey and a clear description of the material and sources, which substantially completes and corrects the very incomplete statements of GORI (Archivio II.) DURUY (p. 413 *seq.*), and CRISTOFORI (Il pontificato di Paolo IV. ed i Carafa suoi nipoti: Miscell. stor. Romana, 1883). The discovery of the

Cardinal Alfonso was collected and calm from the first,[1] Carlo Carafa displayed all his old arrogance. He was still hoping for help from the Spanish king, whose ambassador, Francisco Vargas, came forward as his staunch friend.[2] This, however, could avail him very little, since Vargas, by his importunate and provocative manner, had made himself very unpopular with the Pope.[3] The French ambassador interested himself on behalf of the Duke of Paliano, whom Vargas had deserted.

The confidence of Carlo Carafa in the Spanish king was by no means justified, but all the more zealous were the efforts of Vargas on his behalf.[4] This diplomatist, to whom Pius IV. had, just at that time, on a certain occasion, markedly shown

---

documents in the Papal Secret Archives mentioned above is also due to Ancel; it has, however, escaped him that the Articoli XIV. pro fisco contra card. Carafam, which often appear in manuscript (e.g. Inf. polit., II., 465 *seq.* Library, Berlin; Urb. 853, p. 410 *seq.*, Vatican Library; Cod. 44—B—13 p. 276 *seq.*, Corsini Library, Rome, and in an unsigned Codex of the Bibl. d. Soc. stor. patria at Naples) had already been printed in 1731 by HOFFMANN, Nova script. collectio I., 599 *seq.*, a fact which RANKE (Päpste, I., 209) has also overlooked. The Instrumentum transportationis, assignationis et quietantiae scripturarum Causae contra Carafen. ex officio criminali rev. d. Urbis gubernat. ad arcem S. Angeli de mandato SS^{mi} Patris, dated January 7, 1562, in the Bolett. stor. d. Svizz. Ital., XXXV. (1915), 1.

[1] *Napoli si governa con molta prudentia et religione. Avviso di Roma of July 20, 1560, Urb. 1039, p. 175b (Vatican Library).

[2] *Cf.* Mula's *reports, especially that of June 29, 1560 (Papal Secret Archives).

[3] See the *Avvisi di Roma of May 17 and 24, 1560 (Urb. 1039, pp. 274, 276b, Vatican Library).

[4] *Cf.* ANCEL, Disgrâce, 140 *seqq.* Concerning the intercession of the French ambassador, see also the *Avviso di Roma of August 17, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 191b). An *Avviso of November 23, 1560, tells of the intercession of Cosimo (Urb. 1039, p. 219). Among the other princes who interceded (see *Avviso of September 28, 1560, Urb. 1039, p. 204b, Vatican Library) was the Duke of Bavaria; see STEINHERZ, II., 397.

his disfavour,[1] met with no success, as Cardinal Carafa answered all questions merely by protests and denials. As to his actions before the time of his cardinalate, he appealed to the brief of absolution of Paul IV., and for his later acts to the article of the election capitulation, which only allowed a prosecution at law of a Cardinal, in cases of heresy, schism or high treason.[2] His attitude was as full of challenge as if he had been one of the judges, instead of a prisoner on his trial.[3]

The position of Carlo Carafa was much aggravated by the discovery in July of some very compromising documents concerning his relations with the Turks and the Lutheran Albert Alcibiades of Brandenburg. A Motu Proprio of July 18th decreed that the case now fell under the head of heresy. Ghislieri was now added to the number of the Cardinals acting as assessors,[4] but in consequence of his protracted absence from Rome, he took no actual part in the trial.[1] The report that Carlo Carafa would be forced to a confession by means of torture was repeatedly current in the Curia, but nothing more was done than to make his imprisonment more rigorous in the last week of July. Till then he had had two rooms at his disposal, and had been allowed to receive numerous visits. These privileges were now withdrawn.[2] He then sought to obtain a mitigation of his imprisonment by feigning illness, but the Papal physician, Simone Pasqua, who was sent to him, soon discovered that it was only a case of pretence.[3] This appears to have somewhat broken down the obstinacy of the prisoner. The Venetian ambassador reports on August 24th: "The process, which the Pope has more at heart than anything else, is being carried on with the greatest zeal; interrogations of the prisoners take place every day, morning and evening; the authenticity of the handwriting and seal of Albert of Brandenburg have been proved, whereupon Cueva has advised Carafa to give up lying, to acknowledge his guilt, throw himself on the mercy of the Pope, and think of the salvation of his soul." Carafa, as we are informed by Mula, now caused Pius IV. to be informed that as a man of the world and a soldier, he had been guilty of many things, but that he cast himself upon his mercy, and that he had not even the means of providing for his bare support. The answer of Pius IV. was to the effect that he was now suffering nothing which he had not brought upon himself, that he could promise him nothing, but that he would take care that he did not come to want.[1]

---

[1] It was a question of the protection of a baker, against whom proceedings were to be taken for giving false weight. In order to pacify Pius IV., as an *Avviso di Roma of July 13 relates, Vargas had repeatedly sought an audience. As this was not granted him, he threw himself at the Pope's feet when he met him by chance, and begged for his blessing. Pius IV. said to him, angrily: "Levatevi et non m' impedite la strada." Vargas again begged his blessing, and the Pope answered: "Date prima in mano della justitia tutti quelli ch' hanno fatto quest' insulto alla corte," whereupon Vargas remarked: "Come lo posso dare se sono fuggiti?" At last the Pope did give him his blessing (Urb. 1039, pp. 181b-2, Vatican Library). According to the *report of Mula, of July 12, 1560 (Papal Secret Archives), it was a case of the protection of a painter. Vargas remained steadily in disfavour. On September 12, 1560, Ricasoli *states: Tendilla is very much liked by the Pope, and his nephew, but the opposite is the case with Vargas (State Archives, Florence).

[2] See Ancel, Disgrâce, 98 *seq*.

[3] See the letter of Gabr. Salvago of July 20, 1560 in the Atti Lig., XIII., 762.

[4] *Motu Proprio "Cum nuper," dated July 5, 18, 1560 (Lib. iur. p. 495, Papal Secret Archives). See further Mula's *report of July 6, 1560 (State Library, Vienna), and the *Avvisi di Roma of July 20 and 27, 1560 (Urb. 1039, pp. 175b, 184, Vatican Library).

---

[1] Ghislieri had betaken himself to his see of Mondovi on June 28, 1560 (see MAFFEI, 52), and he appears to have remained there until the autumn.

[2] See *Avviso di Roma of July 20, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 175b, Vatican Library), and the reports of Ricasoli of July 20 and 21, in ANCEL, Disgrâce, 100. An *Avviso of September 7, 1560, related that Pius IV. had angrily answered a remark of Cardinal Puteo to the effect that he did not find it in accordance either with law or reason that the 'corda' should be applied in the case of Carafa, by saying: "che di qui inanzi non haverebbe più carico d' haver il suo esamine et che non se ne dovesse più impacciare" (Urb. 1039, p. 198, Vatican Library).

[3] See the *report of Ricasoli of July 25, 1560 (State Archives, Florence).

The Cardinal suffered no torture, either owing to the fact that it was considered impossible to force him by that means to an admission of his guilt, or because, which is much more likely, several of the Cardinals, especially Cueva, protested against such a procedure.[2] The prisoner again took courage when he escaped torture, and still hoped that the King of Spain would save him. In Rome, where the case of the Carafa had been the great topic of the day, interest in the long drawn-out trial gradually began to flag.[3]

Only at the end of September did the special enquiry approach its end. The documents were copied and a special envoy was to convey a full summary to Philip II.[4] The results of this special enquiry were as follows: Cardinal Alfonso Carafa appears to have enriched himself in an unlawful manner, at the expense of the Holy See, at the time of the death of Paul IV., and to have had a brief drawn up in his favour without the dying Pope having been aware of the matter. Moreover, he was accused of having approved of the murder of the Duchess of Paliano. This dreadful act was the principal accusation against the Duke of Paliano, Lionardo di Cardine, and the Count d'Alife. The greatest number of accusations, no fewer than twenty-two, were those brought against Carlo Carafa. Everything had been collected, and investigations made as far back as his earliest years.[1]

---

[1] See Mula's *letter of Aug. 24, 1560 (a garbled translation in RIESS, 412), Court Library, Vienna. On August 24, 1560, Giulio Grandi *wrote concerning the affair of the Carafa: "Tiensi che hormai non anderano più molto alla longa et credesi fermamente che Carafa et il duca la farà molto male. Napoli non tanto" (State Archives, Modena). The Portuguese ambassador wrote in the same sense; *cf.* Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 34. See also Correspondence of Card. O. Truchsess, 200 *seq.* Mula *reported on August 31: "D. Geremia [Isachino; *cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 223 *seq.*, and Ancel, Disgrâce, 141] di Chietini gionse qui già 4 giorni et parlò il giorno stesso che gionse al pontefice et n' è spedito, dicono che par informatione circa a Caraffa" (Court Library, Vienna).

[2] According to an *Avviso of August 31, 1560, Cardinal Carafa, when threatened with torture, is said to have answered: "che sa molto bene che si vogliono satiar del suo sangue et che faccino quello che vogliono, che di lui non caveranno mai altro di più di quello ch' anno cavato fin all' hora essendo nato cavaliere et cardinale d' honore;" therefore they hesitated to apply the torture, thinking it would be useless (Urb. 1039, p. 194, Vatican Library). *Cf.* the *letter of Mula of July 20, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna); PALLAVICINI, 14, 15, 13 and *infra* p. 160.

[3] See the *letters of Mula of September 7 and 14, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna).

[4] HINOJOSA, 129; ANCEL, Disgrâce, 101, 129.

Carlo Carafa protested against any inquiries being made concerning the crimes of his life as a soldier; he appealed to the brief of absolution which Paul IV. had given him before his appointment as Cardinal. It was more difficult for him to defend himself against those other accusations which belonged to the time of his cardinalate, especially that of the attempted murder of Domenico de' Massimi. No guilt could be proved against him as to the murder of Capece; this concerned only the Duke of Paliano and his two accomplices. It was otherwise, however, with regard to the murder of the Duchess; as to this it was clearly proved that Carlo had been an accessory, still, however crushing the proofs adduced might be, he obstinately entrenched himself against them by systematic lying. Further accusations were to the effect that Carlo had been guilty of heresy. The incidents adduced against him from the time of his life as a soldier were of no account in this respect, but authentic documents proved the relations of the Cardinal with the Protestant Margrave, Albert Alcibiades of Brandenburg. Carlo had to admit them, but maintained that in this case, as well as in his dealings with the Turks, he had only acted as the tool of his uncle. He made use of a similar defence with regard to other political accusations, which laid the blame for the whole of the blunders of Paul IV. upon his shoulders. All this was, however, of no avail; although eight items of the prosecution were withdrawn in the course of the investigation, there still remained fourteen, and those the gravest, to be answered. The root of the accusation lay in the wicked and repeated misuse of his official position in the field of politics, as well as his conduct in the murder of Violante. On the ground of a similar misuse of his political influence, the Duke of Paliano was also accused of having been guilty of high treason.[1] The fact that this aspect of the case was emphasized, caused the whole proceedings to become a political trial, with a very decided bias.

---

[1] See ANCEL, 101 *seqq.*

The choice of prejudiced judges effected the rest, and thus it may well have happened that crimes were attributed to the accused of which they were innocent. With justice did Cardinal Carafa protest against the charge that he had kept the secret agreement of Cave from his uncle's knowledge, nor was it true when the Procurator Fiscal represented Paul IV. as having always been a peaceably disposed Pope. It was certainly unjust to attribute the whole responsibility for the war-like policy against Spain to Carafa. Nevertheless, a great part of the blunders of those days could be traced to him, and it was he, too, who had made war inevitable; while Paul IV. was following out idealistic aims, it is beyond doubt that his nephew was principally animated by selfish motives. Yet, however great may have been the influence exercised by the prejudice of the judges during the trial, and although Cardinal Carafa may have been accused of things of which he was innocent, or only partly guilty, there still remained enough to justify very strict measures being taken against him.[2]

On October 5th a copy of the reports of the trial was conveyed to Cardinal Carafa. In such cases the law required that prisoners on trial should have twenty days to prepare their defence, a period which might be extended by fifteen, and again by ten days more. For this purpose a copy of the minutes of the proceedings must be given them. The prisoners were also allowed to hold conversations, not only with their defenders, but also with their friends, and to arrange for further examinations of witnesses; all this, however, must be done in the presence of a notary.[1]

---

[1] See the excellent details in ANCEL, *loc. cit.*, 102 *seq.*, 118 *seq.*, 141.

[2] *Cf.* ANCEL, Disgrâce, 180-1.

Among the advocates of the Carafa there was in the first place the celebrated Marcantonio Borghese, who had also skilfully defended Cardinal Morone against the accusations of the Inquisition.[2] Besides him, others were also appointed, of whom the Neapolitan, Felice Scalaleone, appears to have been the most active and fearless.[3] The detailed legal opinions in which these jurists elucidated the accusations brought against the Carafa are still in existence; ten of them deal with the defence of each of the two Cardinals, and eight others with that of the Duke of Paliano. The easiest defence was that of Cardinal Alfonso; the most that could be proved against him was that he had kept silence at the murder of the Duchess Violante, the enrichment after the death of Paul IV. not having overstepped the limits of what was usual in such cases.[4]

As far as the political accusations made against Carlo Carafa were concerned, whereby he had jeopardized the highest interests of the Church, the efforts of the defence were concentrated upon proving that the Cardinal, as the chief minister of Paul IV., had only carried out the Pope's intentions, great stress being also laid upon the extraordinarily wide authority, free from all control, which "from time immemorial" had been granted to a cardinal nephew. This point, as well as others upon which the defence laid much stress, was open to discussion, but all their skill did not succeed in absolving Carlo from the guilt of having been an accessory to the murder of the Duchess of Paliano. Extenuating circumstances, especially the exaggerated ideas of honour prevalent in Naples, were brought forward on behalf of the Duke, both for this and for the murder of Capece, the guilt of Violante being taken for granted, though it was by no means proved.[1]

---

[1] See ANCEL, *loc. cit.*, 129 *seq.* According to an *Avviso di Roma of October 5, 1560, seven advocates were appointed for Cardinal Carafa (Urb. 1039, p. 206b, Vatican Library).

[2] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 305. A letter from Cardinal C. Carafa to Borghese in DURUY, 418.

[3] *E qui un avvocato di Napoli, huomo di gran stima in quell' essercitio, il quale scrive et parla assai liberamente, reported Mula on October 26, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna). At the beginning of February, 1561, Scalaleone threatened to go away; see *Avviso di Roma of February 1, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 245b, Vatican Library).

[4] See ANCEL, Disgrâce, 141 *seq.*

The advocates were not the only persons who were working for the prisoners, several members of the Sacred College taking up their case, as for example, Carpi, who, on October 25th, at the beginning of the consistory, raised a great many objections to the proceedings against the Carafa, and loudly demanded justice. Pius IV. defended his action in excited words.[2] Again, when Cosimo I. came to Rome, and had long secret conversations with the Pope, the affair of the Carafa is certain to have been discussed. On November 10th Francesco Tonina definitely informed the Duke of Mantua that Cosimo had interceded for the prisoners.[3] In Rome many people believed that on this account the trial would end in their favour.[1] This view, however, soon proved to be erroneous. The defence of the Duke of Paliano against the accusation of wife-murder, made by his advocate on November 16th, before the Pope and the appointed Cardinals, was a complete failure.[2] On November 23rd it was an open secret that the attempts to remove the prejudiced Federicis from the conduct of the case had proved ineffectual.[3] The wife of Cosimo is reported to have said, on her departure from Rome, that she was leaving the city in order not to be present at the tragedy of the Carafa. On December 14th, Francesco Tonina reported, on the strength of a conversation with the Procurator Fiscal, Pallantieri, that the decision was imminent; twelve notaries were engaged in copying extracts from the minutes of the trial, so that these could be handed to each Cardinal; after Christmas two congregations of Cardinals would be held in order to decide the sentence which would be pronounced upon the Cardinal and the Duke by the Pope himself, and upon the others by the Governor.[4]

---

[1] See *ibid.*, 131 *seqq.*, 139 *seq.*

[2] See in Appendix No. 11 the *report of Mula of October 26, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna). Cardinal Cesi had previously specially interceded for Carafa; see Atti Lig., XIII., 762.

[3] Cosimo, says Tonina's *letter of November 10, 1560, is said to have handed the Pope a petition in favour of the Carafa, "ma è generale opinione che anzi facci secretamente ufficio con loro" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Cosimo had in reality done nothing of consequence for the Carafa, and indeed had perhaps worked definitely against them. Even at that time people were inclined to explain this by saying that the Duke sought in this manner to evade payment of the sum of money which he is said to have promised Cardinal Carafa for the election of Medici. See GNOLI, Nuova Antol., XIX. (1872), 816 *seq.*, and RIESS, 407 *seq.*, who, however, goes too far in his deductions. The intercession of Cosimo for Cardinal del Monte, in whose behalf he was working as early as August, was sincere; see the *letter of Mula of August 3, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna).

---

[1] See the *Avviso di Roma of November 9, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 214, Vatican Library).

[2] *Hoggi si è lungamente udito il governatore com' avogadore d' avanti il pontefice e cardinali deputati, accusando il duca di Palliano con assai vive ragioni dell' homicidio della moglie, e l' avocato del duca rispondendo con assai triste ragioni, per quanto intendo; e si è concluso che si metta in scrittura, accio che il mondo intenda sopra la giustitia che si ha da fare; e del duca predetto non se ne pronostica se non male. Mula on November 16, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna).

[3] *Avviso di Roma of November 23, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 219, Vatican Library).

[4] *Li Caraffi s' hanno per ispediti et questa mattina sendo io col fiscale del Palantieri, m' ha detto che non s' attende ad altro che alla ispeditione, et duodeci notari non fanno altro che scrivere li sommarii delli processi, de quai sommarii si ne hanno a dare a ciascun card^{le} per ciascuno uno, et di qua da Natale s' hanno per quanto ho inteso da far due congregationi, nelle quali si spediranno. Li dui card^{li} sarranno giudicati dal Papa istesso et insieme il duca di Paliano, gli altri poi dal governatore, et ancora che si credi che si debba commutare la pena della vita in carcere perpetuo, non

Tonina was very well informed, for the congregations he speaks of were held in the second week of January, 1561. The Pope, who devoted from three to four hours daily to the study of the minutes of the trial, again gave audience to the advocates of the Carafa; the latter appeared to be very much depressed, and people in general looked for a result unfavourable to the prisoners, even to the Cardinal; banishment for life at the least seemed to be his fate.[1] Owing to his long imprisonment, Carlo Carafa was hardly in a position to continue the payment of his necessary subsistence, as he, like all other prisoners of this class, had to support himself. A Mantuan correspondent gives details of the miserable condition of this once so proud and tyrannical family, and recalls the arrogance of the Cardinal during the recent conclave.[2]

At a consistory on January 15th, 1561, the Procurator Fiscal, Pallantieri, reported the conclusion of the proceedings, and begged the Pope to order the Governor of the city to present his final report, at the next consistory, as to the crimes of which the accused had been found guilty as a result of the investigation: sentence would then follow. Pius IV. agreed,

---

di meno si va discorrendo che quella gli debba durar poco, et perchè queste cose vengono di bocca et di loro che può saper qualche cosa, si giudica che gia sia risoluto il tutto, benchè non sia antora data la sentenza (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). *Cf.* Correspondence of Card. O. Truchsess, 229, 231.

[1] *Avviso di Roma of January 11, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 204b-1, Vatican Library).

[2] In Fr. Tonina's *letter to the Duke of Mantua, dated Rome, January 15, 1561, he says, concerning the Carafa: "Sono essi tutti ridotti a tanta miseria, a quanto questi dì mi narrava la madre del card^{le} Vitelli, che muoiono di fame, a tale che il card^{le} ha venduto la tonicella, et con questi termini si ne passano la vita loro, questi che al tempo del zio erano tanto orgogliosi et superbi et particolarmente poi intendo il detto card^{le} ch' era nel conclave, come se li altri cardinali 'tutti fussero stati suoi servitori." (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). *Cf.* in Appendix No. 12, the *report of Tonina of February 22, 1561. Bondonus relates, moreover, (p. 539) that he had visited Cardinal Carafa on January 15, 1561 and had remained to dinner with him.

and ordered that no other matter should be placed upon the agenda for the consistory, in view of the probable length of the report.[1] Almost two whole months passed before this meeting was held; the reason for the delay is to be found in the letters which the Duke of Paliano addressed to the Pope from his prison in the Tor di Nona.[2]

The first of these letters is dated January 17th, 1561. In it the Duke begs for mercy for his young children, and at the same time makes certain revelations which he had hitherto concealed out of consideration for his brothers. These admissions concern the beginning of the conflict of Paul IV. with the Imperialists,[3] the suit against the Colonna, and, above all, the tragedy at Gallese. The Duke confesses as follows: "If I remember correctly, the letter brought to me by Captain Vico de' Nobili, contained the expression that the Cardinal had said that he would no longer acknowledge me as his brother if I did not clear myself from shame by means of the death of the Duchess. I showed this letter to Leonardo de Cardena, and we decided between ourselves that he should murder the Duchess at Sant' Eutichio, on the road from Gallese to Soriano. When Don Leonardo arrived at Soriano he found the Count d' Alife there, who was himself just on the point of carrying out the deed, but he prevented him from doing so. They then sent Bernardino Olario to me, to whom I made answer as is recorded in my first examination. I might have forbidden it, but said that I wanted to have nothing to do with the matter. It was my own wish to wait for my wife's confinement, and what I said was with the object of delaying the deed. Nevertheless, the Duchess was killed. When I learned of her death I was exceedingly grieved, and wept bitterly. In order to find consolation I sent to my painter, by name Moragna, a Spaniard living at Viterbo, and commissioned him to send the father, Fra Pietro,[1] to me at Soriano, where I lay ill. The father came, and I excused myself to him for the death of the Duchess by saying that my honour in the eyes of the world had caused me to consent. What now follows, I do not say to justify myself, but only in the interests of truth. I had not ordered the death of the Duchess, but wished everyone to believe that I had allowed it to take place, merely out of consideration for my honour. I speak freely here, and not as one who is before a court of law; may this be held in my favour." The Duke also represented his brother as guilty in the matter of the galleys. In a second letter, dated February 6th, he gave yet further details concerning this affair and the law-suit against the Colonna, and here, likewise, he attributed all the guilt to the promptings of his brother. In this letter, signed merely with the name "Giovanni Carafa" no further allusion is made to the murder of the Duchess.[2] According to a report of Mula, the Duke, completely broken down by his eight months imprisonment, is even said to have expressed a wish that his obstinate brother, who still denied everything, should be forced to a confession by torture.[3] As a matter of fact, the instruments of torture were actually taken to the Castle of St. Angelo, but even this did not intimidate Carlo Carafa; his assertions grew bolder and more arrogant than ever.[4]

---

[1] See Acta consist. in GULIK-EUBEL, 38, and ANCEL, Disgrâce, 143.

[2] *Hiera l' altra, announces Giulio Grandi on January 16, 1561, the Duke of Paliano was taken from the Castle of St. Angelo to the Tor di Nona (State Archives, Modena).

[3] *Cf.* Vol. XIV. of this work, p. 94 *seq.*

---

[1] One of the Capuchins who gave spiritual consolation to the Duchess at the time of her death; see *supra* p. 138.

[2] Both letters of the Duke of Paliano to the Pope are in the *Liber iurium (Papal Secret Archives; see note 1 *supra* p. 148) pp. 578-9, and 574-5. The first is printed in the Arch. stor. Ital., XII., 456-8, but with a small omission. The second letter, of February 6, 1561, is all in his own hand. In the first letter only the signature is by the Duke himself, and even this is not certain; perhaps the whole is merely a copy.

[3] According to Mula's *report of February 1, 1561, the Duke of Paliano is supposed to have said: "Se il cardinale sarà levato quattro dita di terra, confesserà ogni cosa" (Papal Secret Archives)

[4] *Fu portata la corda in Castello et ordinato che si fosse tormentato il card. Carafa, *ma non intendo che sia stato eseguito*, e quel cardinale parla altamente come prima e più ancora, reports

The second letter had hardly reached the hands of the Pope when another event occurred. During the night between February 7th and 8th, Cardinal Scipione Rebiba, who had enjoyed the special confidence of Paul IV., was arrested. He was accused of having grossly neglected his duty during his legation in the year 1556 by not having continued his journey to Brussels, of having extorted a brief concerning certain benefices from the dying Pope, and of having been accessory to the murder of the Duchess of Paliano, by sanctioning the proceedings of Carlo Carafa.[1] This new arrest caused the greatest sensation. Four members of the College of Cardinals were now in the Castle of St. Angelo, and it was expected that yet other Cardinals and prelates who had played an important part under Paul IV. would be called to account.[2] On February 21st it was reported that the advocates of the Carafa had appeared before the Pope and the Cardinals and had spoken with them for several hours. They complained bitterly of the biased conduct of the Procurator Fiscal and the Governor. Thereupon the Pope decided to go through the documents once more, saying that he wished to temper

---

Mula, on February 8, 1561 (Papal Secret Archives, *loc. cit.* 443). It is therefore a mistake when Fr. Tonina, in a *letter of January 29, 1561, maintains that the Cardinal had been tortured. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). An *Avviso di Roma of February 15, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 252b, Vatican Library) makes the same statement. It was difficult to know the truth, for everything took place in the strictest secrecy; *Delli Carafa le cose vanno secretissime, writes Tonina on February 15, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[1] *Cf.* besides Mula's **report of February 8, 1561 (Papal Secret Archives) the *Avvisi di Roma of February 8 and 15, (Urb. 1039, pp. 251, 252b, Vatican Library) and the *letter of Vargas of February 15, 1561 (Simancas Archives) translated and commented on in ANCEL, Disgrâce, 146 n. 3. See also Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 351; BONDONUS, 539, and the report of the Portuguese ambassador of February 16, 1561, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 184.

[2] *Avviso di Roma of February 8, 1561 (Urb. 1039, Vatican Library).

justice with mercy.[1] The Duke of Paliano was, in the meantime, again brought from the Tor di Nona to the Castle of St. Angelo, evidently that he might be confronted with his brother. It was at once rumoured that two of the guards had been arrested, and it occasioned a still greater sensation when soldiers were secretly concentrated in the city.[2]

In these days of excitement the great creation of Cardinals took place which was connected with the fall of the Carafa. For a long time there had been talk of an increase of the Sacred College, and this took place quite unexpectedly on February 26th, 1561.[3] No less than eighteen Cardinals were appointed, among them such excellent men as Girolamo Seripando, Stanislaus Hosius, Ludovico Simonetta, Marcantonio Mula and Bernardo Navagero. These received the purple in connection with the Council; in the case of the others, considerations of another kind led to their elevation. The appointments of Bernardo Salviati, and of the French ambassador, Babou de la Bourdaisière, were made to please the French government, while the elevation of Iñigo de Avalos de Aragon and of Antoine Perrenot de Granvelle testified to a desire to please Philip II. It is very remarkable that Cosimo I. only succeeded in getting a very distant relative, the Spaniard, Francisco Pacheco, appointed. The lion's share in the creation was carried off by the party of the Gonzaga, who were inimical to the Carafa. Besides the nephew of Cardinal Ercole, the twenty-four-year-old Francesco Gonzaga, the following received the purple on February 26th: Ludovico Madruzzo, Luigi d'Este and the Pope's nephew, Mark Sittich von Hohenems, as well as Alfonso Gesualdo and Pier Francesco Ferreri, then nuncio in Venice, who were related to the Pope's nephew. On the other hand, however, the opponents of Gonzaga, the Farnese, who were so powerful owing to their connection with the court of Philip, received due consideration. Their interests were already served by the appointment of Granvelle and Iñigo de Avalos, but in addition to these, the new Cardinals, Girolamo da Correggio and the Bishop of Brescia, Francesco Gambara, were also among their faithful adherents.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* *Avviso di Roma of February 22, 1561 (Urb. 1039, Vatican Library).

[2] *Cf.* in Appendix No. 12, the *report of Fr. Tonina of February 22, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] See PETRAMELLARIUS, 66 *seq.*; GIACONIUS, III., 905 *seq.*; CARDELLA, V., 9 *seq.*; GULIK-EUBEL, 41 *seq.* Characteristics of the persons in question in Cod. Vat. 7248, p. 155 *seq.*, Vatican Library. Concerning the consistory, Fr. Tonina *reported on February 26, 1561, that "conflitti et controversie" had arisen therein, so that it only ended at the twenty-second hour of the night (*cf.* also Arco's *report in the State Archives, Vienna, mentioned by SICKEL, Konzil, 179). On the same day Tonina writes: *Il Papa è stato in pensiero solo di quattro o sei al più, poi di dieci et poi di tredici sino a questa mattina, et ultimamente si è risoluto de desdotto, a tal che hieri sera solo si trattò dell' abate di Gambara, ne prima vi era pensamento alcuno, et tutto hieri non si fece altro che far congregationi duplicate sopra il, patriarca d' Aquileia, il quale finalmente è stato escluso, sotto pretesto che già fu inquisito d' eresia de non so che articolo della giustificatione. Si è ragionato tutti dì anco che S.S^{ta} si reservava in petto l'ill^{mo} S. Federico nostro fratello di V. Ecc. et alcuni anco dicevano che forse l' haveria potuto publicare, et da ciascuno era tenuto che dovesse ispedir prima la causa de Caraffi, come si havea ragionato nella congregatione, della causa loro, tutta via quasi un subito poi S. S^{ta} si n' è spedita (Gonazga Archives, Mantua).

On February 27th, 1561, the last period allowed by the law of those days to the prisoners for their further defence, had expired. When the Pope went to the consistory on that date an advocate of the Carafa cast himself at the feet of His Holiness and begged for mercy for his clients. The answer of Pius IV. was to the effect that he had better get out of his way.[1] At that time, as the Pope expressed it, there were four capital C's which gave him great anxiety: the Cardinals, the Carafa, the Council, and the Colonna.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* Hilliger, 18 *seq.*; Šusta, Kurie, II., 409; Herre, 66 *seq.*; Q. Bigi, Vita del card. G. da Correggio, 47 *seq.*, Milan, 1864. The red hat had already been prophesied for Francesco Gonzaga in 1558 (see Giorn. ligustico, 1887, 436 *seq.*). Pius IV. had, in an autograph letter, as early as June 18, 1560, secretly intimated to Luigi d'Este that he would create him cardinal (*Original in State Archives, Modena). In Min. bred., Arm., 44 t. 10, n. 30-40, are the *briefs to the newly appointed cardinals dated February 27, 1561; in that to Avalos the petition of Philip II. is remembered, and in that to Salviati, that of Catherine de' Medici (Papal Secret Archives).

There now remained only one hope for the Carafa: the intervention of the Spanish king. Cardinal Carafa had counted on him from the first, all the more so as all the time Vargas had remained his firm friend. When the whole world had abandoned the unhappy man, the ambassador had only held the more faithfully to him. He even dared, in covert terms, to reproach his king for his reserve,[3] but now, as at first, Philip took refuge in silence. The way in which he determined his attitude is evident from the significant words which he wrote to Tendilla on August 11th, 1560. In these he expresses the impatience with which he was awaiting the arrival of Santa Croce, who had started from Rome on July 14th, so that he might know what attitude he had better adopt, as, however anxious he might be to please the Pope, it would not be good policy on his part altogether to abandon Cardinal Carafa, lest he should be accused of ingratitude.[4] It was evident that the king did not wish to commit himself prematurely. Santa Croce disclosed to Philip II., in the name of Pius IV., that Raverta had gone too far in his recommendation of the Carafa, and that the Pope had been unable to communicate his real views concerning the family to the Spanish court, as the nuncio, as well as Vargas, were adherents of the nephews of Paul IV. Santa Croce had also brought with him, from the minutes of the proceedings against the Carafa, a collection of the criminal statements and calumnies of which Carlo Carafa had made use in order to cause deadly enmity between Paul IV., Charles V. and Philip II. The further documents, relating to Carlo's negotiations with the Protestants and the Turks for the overthrow of the Hapsburgs were sent after Santa Croce, as he was already on his way.

---

[1] Avviso di Roma of March 1, 1561, in Ancel, Disgrâce, 146 n. 5.

[2] *Dicono che S.S^{ta} diceva haver quattro C grandi ch'l travagliavano la mente cioè: Cardinali, Caraffa, Concilio, Colonnesi. Letter of Fr. Tonina of February 28, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] See Ancel, 149-50; *Ibid.*, 147, concerning the intervention of France for the Duke of Paliano. Albert V. of Bavaria interceded for both the Cardinal and the Duke; see Correspondence of Card O. Truchsess, 211, 216, 218 *seq.*, 225 *seq.*, 233.

[4] See Ancel, 150 n. 4. Concerning the mission of Santa Croce *cf*. Corpo dipl. Portug., VIII., 483 *seq.*; IX., 9 *seq.*, 16 *seq.*; Pallavicini, 14, 15, 8; Miscell. d stor. Ital, V., 526 *seq.*; Hinojosa, 121 *seq.*

Philip II. could now throw aside his reserve, and give free play to his old vindictiveness against Cardinal Carafa without any danger to himself, although there were still reasons why he should not make his real intentions quite public. Vargas received orders on September 5th, 1560, to moderate his zeal for the prisoners, and he submitted to the wishes of his master, writing to him, however, on January 5th, 1561, that he had obeyed his instructions, but that His Majesty, by failing to do anything for the Carafa, was committing a grave error.[1]

This had not escaped Philip himself, and several of his letters testify to the painful state of embarrassment in which he found himself. If he requited the services of the Cardinal during the conclave by completely abandoning him, not only would his reputation be endangered, but his interests as well, for the prospects of Cardinal Gonzaga obtaining the tiara would thereby be greatly furthered.[2] In the end Philip acted in accordance with the advice of the Farnese; he left the secular members of the house of Carafa to their fate, and interceded only for the life of the Cardinal. This he did by means of an autograph letter written to the Pope on February 11th, 1561, from Toledo, which reached Rome on Saturday, March 1st. The consistory at which the decision was to be made was fixed for Monday, March 3rd, the letter of intercession thus arriving almost at the last moment. It came, however, in time to give, to the uninitiated, the appearance that the king was protecting the Cardinal, but much too late to make the Pope withdraw from the course he had already entered upon. When Vargas handed him the letter on March 2nd, Pius IV. answered in general terms that he declined to postpone the consistory.[1] The consistory therefore took place on March 3rd as arranged, and lasted for eight hours. The Governor, by order of the Procurator Fiscal, presented a summary of the minutes of the proceedings against Cardinal Carlo Carafa, the Duke of Paliano, the Count d'Alife, and Lionardo di Cardine, which took seven hours to read out, and demanded the condemnation of the accused. The enumeration of the offences made a deep impression, and many Cardinals who had intended to say a word in favour of Alfonso or Carlo Carafa remained silent. Este alone endeavoured to refute the accusation concerning the alliance made with France, a thing which he understood perfectly. After the minutes of the case had been read out, the Pope handed to the Governor a sealed roll of paper, which was only to be opened by special order, with the words that he was pronouncing the final sentence. Thereupon Cardinals Carpi, Farnese, Este, Crispi and Savelli arose, begging the Pope not to show the extremity of severity, and to have consideration for the dignity of the Sacred College. Their pleading bore as little fruit as did a new attempt on the part of Vargas to induce Pius IV. to show clemency.[2] The final step was taken on March 4th, when the sealed roll was opened in the presence of the advocates; this contained the sentence of death on Cardinal Carlo Carafa, the Duke of Paliano, the Count d'Alife and Lionardo di Cardine.[1] In any case all four had deserved death on account of the murder of the Duchess, but the justice of the other accusations, especially that of high treason against Giovanni and Carlo Carafa, is open to doubt.[2] The estates of the condemned were to be confiscated.[3]

---

[1] ANCEL is the first (pp. 150-1) to have brought these letters to light and to make use of them.

[2] See HILLIGER, 17.

---

[1] *Cf.* HILLIGER, 17, and ANCEL, Disgrâce, 151 *seq.* The text of the letter of Philip II., of February 11, 1561, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 353.

[2] The best report of the consistory is in the *letter of Vargas of March 14, 1561 (Simancas Archives) used by ANCEL, *loc. cit.*, 152. *Cf.* also the report of N. Tiepolo in NARDUCCI, Cat. I., 322, the Florentine report in the Arch. stor. Ital., XII., 297, 298 n., and the slightly divergent report of Fr. Tonina, of March 5, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). See Appendix No. 14; *cf.* No. 13 (Acta consist. Cam., Consistorial Archives). The Acta consist. in GULIK-EUBEL, 38, report very laconically, as does Massarelli (in MERKLE, II., 352).

When the sentence of death was communicated to Cardinal Carafa, he did not say a word; his companions in misfortune were taken from the Castle of St. Angelo back to the Tor di Nona. The Count d'Alife and Lionardo di Cardine were overcome by despair, and the Capuchins who were sent to them had a hard task.[4] On the other hand, Giovanni Carafa was quite composed; he had long given up all hope, and had prepared himself for death by retreats with the Jesuit, Peruschi.[5] These spiritual exercises had completely changed the unhappy man; religion gave him such power that he went joyfully to his death, because it was for him the way of his salvation. With crucifix in hand, the Duke prepared his two companions for their fate, addressing such beautiful Christian words to them that it seemed as if he were only fulfilling the office of a consoler, and not himself about to be executed.[1]

---

[1] *Report of Mula of March 6, 1561 (State Archives, Venice). See ANCEL, Disgrâce, 153. *Cf.* also the report of Tiepolo, *loc. cit.*

[2] Upon the question of guilt *cf.* GNOLI in the N. Antologia, XIX. (1872), 813 *seq.* Benrath maintains with justice that, even after the doubtful accusations had been withdrawn, there remained sufficient proof; see HERZOG, Realenzyklopädie, XV^3, 437 *seq.*

[3] The sentence on Cardinal Carafa has not been found up to the present; in all probability it was destroyed when the case was revised. The sentence of death on the Duke of Paliano and his two companions, dated March 4, 1561, in GORI, Archivio, II., 260 *seq.*

[4] *Cf.* the *report of Fr. Tonina of March 5, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). In the book of the *Giustiziati, Vol. 3, in the archives of S. Giovanni Decollato (State Archives, Rome), there is a note on pp. 167b-9 that members of the Misericordia were called on March 5 "a un hora mezzo di notte" to "Conte d' Aliffe, ducca di Paliano and L. de Cardine." The Duke bequeathed to the Confraternity "venti scudi alla capella S. Giovanni decollato per mia devotione et elemosina."

[5] See MANAREUS, De rebus Soc. Iesu, 126, Florence, 1886. *Cf.* GNOLI, *loc. cit.*, 817.

One cannot but read the letters which Carafa addressed in his last hours to his sister and his only son, Diomede, with deep emotion. "Praised be the name of Our Lord, Jesus Christ, for all eternity," he says in the letter to his son. "This paper contains, I believe, the last words and advice I shall be able to address to you in this life ; I pray God that they may be such as a father should address to his only son. As the first and most necessary thing, I must bring to your recollection that in all your dealings and inclinations you must prove yourself a true servant of God, and show that you love His Divine Majesty far above yourself, and set aside your own pleasure, satisfaction and will, in order not to offend your Creator and Redeemer, even though you were promised worldly greatness, honour and happiness. If you follow this good and necessary rule of conduct, everything else that you do will be well and honourably accomplished. As you must be faithful, after God, to the prince whom He has set over us, then serve the Majesty of the Catholic King, as becomes a true and honourable Christian knight. Flee from sin as it engenders death ; choose rather to die than imperil your soul ; be the enemy of vice ; seek after honourable and pious company ; go often to confession ; receive frequently the holy sacraments, which are the medicine of the soul, destroy sin, and preserve man in the grace of God ; have compassion on the misery of others ; practise works of piety, and flee from idleness, and from conversations and pursuits which are not fitting for you ; take pains to acquire some knowledge of science and letters, for these are very necessary for a true nobleman, especially for one who has power and vassals, as well as to be able to enjoy the sweet fruits of the Holy Scriptures, which are so precious for both soul and body. If you savour such fruits, then you will despise the things of this sorrowful world, and find no small consolation in the present life. I wish you to show indomitable courage at my death, not behaving like a child, but as a reasonable man, and not listening to the promptings of the flesh, or to the love of your father, or to the talk of the world. For your consolation, ponder well the fact that whatever happens is ordained by the decrees of the great God, Who rules the universe with infinite wisdom, and, as it appears to me, shows me great mercy by taking me hence in this manner, rather than in any other way, for which I always thank Him, as you also must do. May it only please Him to exchange this my life for that other, the false and deceitful for the true. Do not be troubled by whatever people may say or write; say to everyone: My father is dead, because God has shown him great grace, and I hope He has saved him, and granted him a better existence. Therewith I die, but you shall live, and bear no one ill-will of my death."[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* the report of Tiepolo, *loc. cit.*, in which, however, the date is wrong.

While Giovanni Carafa was writing these lines, the Captain of the military police, Gasparino de Melis, proceeded to the prison of Cardinal Carafa in the Castle of St. Angelo.[2] When he appeared, accompanied by torchbearers, in the antechamber of the Cardinal's cell, he was told that the prisoner was asleep. When the Captain declared that, in spite of this, he must enter, the door was opened. Carafa awoke, raised himself, and asked what was wanted. The sentence of death had already been announced to him on the previous day, but he did not believe that it would ever be carried out. When he now learned that there was no longer any hope, he repeated more than ten times: "I am to die! The Pope wishes that I should die!" Gas-

---

[1] The letter of the Duke of Paliano to his son is printed in CACCIAGUERRA, Epist. spirit. (*cf.* NOVAES, VII., 148), again in PHIL. HONORII Thesaur. poli., II., 137, and finally in the Arch. stor. Ital., XII., 458 *seq.* (trans. by REUMONT, Carafa, I., 233 *seq.*, and Beiträge, I., 505 *seq.*), the letter to his sister, the Marchesa di Polignano, in FR. CRISTOFORI, Il pontificato di Paolo IV. (Miscell. Rom., 2, Ser. 1, 1888), 131. Both letters had already been published in a French translation in a rare pamphlet *Sentence prononcee contre le card. Carafa etc.*, Lyons, 1561. The letter to his son also appeared in a German pamphlet (Abdruck des Herzogen von Paliano schreybens, etc., *s. l.* 1561) and was widely read; see KLUCKHOHN, Briefe, I., 175.

[2] The execution of Carafa is described in various, for the most part anonymous accounts, in Italian and Spanish. These accounts which agree in essential points, but differ in details, are very often to be found in the collections of manuscripts of the XVIth century; in the Vatican Library, Cod. Ottob., 2241, p. 262 *seq.*, and Urb. 1670, p. 92 *seq.*; in the Corsini Library, 44—B—13, p. 355 *seq.*; in the Casanate Library, E. III., 30 (see GORI, Archivio, II., 302);

---

in the Capponi Library, now in the National Lib., Florence (*cf.* Reumont, Beiträge, I., 518); in the Royal Library, Berlin, Inf. polit., II., 517 *seq.* (in Spanish, the same in Urb. 853, p. 464 *seq.*). One of these reports was already published in Phil. Honorii Thesaur. polit., II., 134 *seq.*; Cristofori has printed three (I., 102 *seq.*, 145 *seq.*, 149 *seq.*), a fourth is in Gori, Arch., II., 302 *seq.*; a fifth (which only refers to the execution of the Cardinal) is in Barb. lat. 5674, pp. 170-1, Vatican Library (used by Ancel, Disgrâce, 153 n.). All these accounts, which were followed by Bromato, by the editor of Nores (Arch. stor. Ital., XII., 344) and also by Ranke (Päpste, I^{3}., 209) are more or less highly coloured, in part even romantically so. The most authentic account was hitherto unknown; I found it in the Gonzaga Archives, Mantua, and it is a *letter of Fr. Tonina, to whom Gasparino de Melis himself described the proceedings at the execution, and is dated Rome, March 8, 1561 (see Appendix No. 17). Good accounts are also given in a letter from Rome of March 8, 1561, which is given in the above mentioned 'Sentence,' the report of Tiepolo in Narducci, Cat. I., 322, the *report of Mula of March 7, 1561, Papal Secret Archives (see Appendix No. 16), the letter of Sfrondato of March 15 in Arch. stor. Lomb., XXX. (1903), 358, the 'Letra de Roma' of March 7, 1561 in Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 354 *seq.*, the *Avviso di Roma of March 8, Vatican Library (see Appendix No. 16), and lastly the interesting letter which the Dominican Timoteo da Perugia sent on March 9, 1561, to his brethren at Florence, published by H. Geisenheimer, Sulla morte del card. Carafa (Estr. dal Rosario), 6 *seq.*, Florence, 1907 (here too is given the name of the Cardinal's confessor, Francesco d' Arezzo). *Cf.* also Massarelli in Merkle, II., 352 *seq.*; Bondonus, 540. It is uncertain in what part of the Castle of St. Angelo the execution took place; see Borgatti, 134 *seq.*

parino had difficulty in making the unhappy man understand that the hour of his death had now irrevocably arrived, and that only a short time remained to him to go to confession, and make his final arrangements. With the sorrowful cry: "I, who have admitted nothing, am to die!" the Cardinal at length arose and dressed. The biretta was refused to him, and thereby he knew that he was deposed from his rank as Cardinal Deacon. "O ungrateful Pius!" he cried, "O King Philip! thou hast betrayed me!" Then a priest, belonging to a religious order, who had been appointed to hear his confession, entered: it lasted for an hour. After this Carafa seemed calmer; he had all the attendants brought in, and called upon them to witness that he forgave the Pope, the King of Spain, the Governor, the Procurator Fiscal, and all his enemies. After he had said the seven penitential psalms, he courageously offered his neck to the executioner. When the latter drew the knot, the rope broke; another was taken, which also broke, and it was only with the greatest difficulty that the executioner was able to complete his work.[1] The body of Cardinal Carafa, who was aged only forty-two years, was then taken to the still unfinished church of S. Maria Traspontina, near the Castle of St. Angelo.

Gasparino de Melis, with the executioner, hurried away from the body of Cardinal Carafa to the Tor di Nona. He found the Duke of Paliano, with the Count d'Alife and Lionardo di Cardine, in the chapel, where, assisted by a Jesuit, they were preparing for death. Their Christian resignation, and their real contrition moved even the Brothers of the Misericordia who were present, though they were used to such scenes. The scaffold was erected in the courtyard of the prison, and while prayers were being said for them, the three guilty men suffered death. Their bodies were publicly exposed on the morning of March 6th in the neighbouring square, near the Ponte Sant Angelo. The decapitated body of the Duke lay on a little bier, which was covered with a black, gold-embroidered cloth, beside the statue to the Apostle St. Paul at the entrance to the bridge; at his right, on the ground, on miserable rags, lay his brother-in-law, and at his left, Lionardo di Cardine. Only in the evening were the bodies, like those of ordinary criminals, taken by the Brothers of the Misericordia to S. Giovanni Decollato, and finally buried in the church of the Minerva, in the family chapel of the Annunciata. The body of Cardinal Carafa was also taken later to this church, and buried in the same chapel.[1]

---

[1] The horrible incident gave the humanist, Niccolò Franco, occasion to write the following epigram:—

Extinxit laqueus vix te, Carafa, secundus;
Tanto enim sceleri non satis unus erit.

A light placed on the summit of the Castle of St. Angelo informed Pius IV. of the carrying out of the sentence; his severity caused terror on every side.[2] Many in Rome blamed the Pope for having been too harsh; it was especially found fault with that the Cardinal had been put to death like the rest, and that the bodies of the three others, though they had deserved to die, should have been buried like ordinary criminals.[3] For several days fears were entertained for the lives of the three other Cardinals who were still in the Castle of St. Angelo,[4] but the representative of Cosimo I.

---

[1] *Cf.* *Giustiziati, III., p. 169b, in the Archives of S. Giovanni Decollato. There (p. 169) we read concerning the execution: *Li retro e sopranominati cioè il sig^r ducha di Paliano il sig^r conte d' Aliffe, 'l sig^r don Leonardo di Cardines, a uno a uno furno condotti dabasso nel cortile di Torre di Nona e li talliatoli la testa dalle hore nove sino a hore XI incircha giovedi addi 6 di marzo e poi furno condotti in Ponte e lassati fino a ore XV incircha, e poi si fecieno portare alla nostra chiesia dove venne oltra e' 30 deputati alcuni altri delli nostri fratelli e assai bono numero; e per tale exeque si prese otto preti oltre il nostro capellano (State Archives, Rome).

[2] See the dispatches of the ambassadors in ANCEL, Disgrâce, 159; Istoria di Chiusi in TARTINIUS, Script., I., 1078.

[3] See Vargas in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 362; SFONDRATO, *loc. cit.*, 359, and the report of the Portuguese ambassador of March 6, 1561, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 195.

[4] See in Appendix No. 17 the *report of Fr. Tonina of March 8, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua) and the *Avvisi di Roma of March 22 and 29, April 18, May 3 and 31, 1561 (Urb. 1039, pp. 261b, 265b, 268, 271, 278b, Vatican Library). *Cf.* BONDONUS, 540.

learned on March 17th that they would be pardoned.[1] The youthful, and absolutely innocent Cardinal Alfonso Carafa, aroused great sympathy,[2] and for him the King of Spain, the Viceroy of Naples, and the Duke of Florence interceded. Alfonso was completely broken down. He promised everything they asked; renunciation of the gifts of Paul IV., and of the office of President of the Apostolic Camera, as well as the payment of a fine of 100,000 gold scudi. On March 24th his pardon was decided on, and on April 4th he was released from the Castle of St. Angelo. A bull of Pius IV. suppressed the office of President of the Apostolic Camera, and Cardinal Alfonso had to confirm this in writing. In secret, however, he drew up protests against this, as well as against all the other things which he had been made to promise.[3] On October 10th, 1561, he again appeared, to the great joy of everyone, in the consistory.[4] When, in August, 1562, fresh suspicion fell upon Alfonso, through the discovery of a letter of Cardinal du Bellay, he thought it advisable to retire to his archdiocese of Naples,[5] where he died, worn out by grief, on August 29th, 1565, aged only twenty-four years.[1]

---

[1] See the *letter of Saraceni of March 17, 1561 (State Archives, Florence).

[2] As the Cardinal was not yet 25 years of age, by the *Motu Proprio *Cum ad aures*, of July 26, 1560 (Lib. iur., p. 498, Papal Secret Archives) a procurator was appointed for him in the person of Cardinal Bertrand.

[3] See MASSARELLI, 354; BONDONUS, 541; *letter of Saraceni of March 21, 22 and 26, 1561 (State Archives, Florence); *report of G. Grandi of March 26, 1561 (State Archives, Modena); GORI, Archivio, II., 311 *seq.*, and especially ANCEL, Disgrâce, 160 *seq.* Concerning the intercession made in favour of Cardinal Alfonso, *cf.* the brief in RAYNALDUS, 1561 n. 80 and *that to the Viceroy of Naples of April 13, 1561, Min. brev. 11, n. 51, Papal Secret Archives. See also Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 215. Among those who efficaciously helped Cardinal Alfonso in the payment of the enormous fine was Ugo Boncompagni (see MAFFEI, I., 9). *Cf.* REUMONT, Carafa, I., 238.

[4] See the *report of Saraceni of October 10, 1561 (State Archives, Florence).

[5] See the *report of Fr. Tonina of August 22, 1562 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

The Duke of Florence had also interceded for Cardinal del Monte, Cardinals Ricci and Cicada likewise taking up his cause;[2] the former, indeed, was very active on his behalf.[3] Nevertheless, the decision of his case was very long delayed. It was rumoured in July, 1561, that del Monte had been condemned to pay a fine of 100,000 scudi, and was only to be released on the condition that he should forfeit his Cardinal's hat at the first offence.[4] His release was delayed until the autumn. He had to promise to improve his manner of life, to pay the fine and give up his benefices.[5] He was banished to Tivoli and two Jesuits were sent to labour for his conversion.[6]

Cardinal Rebiba, for whose life his friends trembled even at the end of October, 1561,[7] was only set at liberty on January 31st, 1562. The whole College of Cardinals had interceded for him. He was again allowed to take part in the consistory in March.[8]

---

[1] *Cf.* GIACONIUS, III., 862; GULIK-EUBEL, 39.

[2] See *Avvisi di Roma of March 22 and July 7, 1561 (Urb. 1039, pp. 261b, 286b, Vatican Library); *letter of Saraceni of April 4, 1561 (State Archives, Florence).

[3] See the *letters of Saraceni of April 30 and June 10, 1561 (State Archives, Florence).

[4] See *Avviso di Roma of July 12, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 287, Vatican Library).

[5] See *Avvisi di Roma of August 2, September 6 and 20, 1561 (Urb. 1039, pp. 291b, 298, Vatican Library); BONDONUS, 542. P. L. Bruzzone has published the confession of del Monte, dated: 'In Castello, 20 Settembre 1561,' in the Roman Messagero, 1911, No. 198.

[6] *Avvisi di Roma of September 6 and 20, and October 11, 1561 (Urb. 1039, pp. 298, 300, 303, Vatican Library). Saraceni *reported on October 10, 1561, that del Monte was at Tivoli "con dui preti reformati quali scrivono che il principio della vita del cardinale è buono." (State Archives, Florence).

[7] *Avviso di Roma of October 25, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 305b, Vatican Library).

[8] *Avvisi di Roma of January 10 and 31, and March 7, 1562 (Urb. 1039, pp. 330, 335b, 343b, Vatican Library).

Philip II. benefited greatly by the downfall of the Carafa; in May, 1561, a bull was expressly issued to protect him against the serious allegations made against him by Cardinal Carafa in the time of Paul IV.[1] The king's attitude during the whole tragedy, had been of such a nature that he attained his object of destroying his old enemies without committing himself on either side. His share in the fall of the nephews of Paul IV. remained the secret of but few people, but the Spanish king had been able to keep himself free from all odium by interceding at the last moment for Cardinal Carlo, again by cooperating in the release of Cardinal Alfonso, and lastly by affording the Marquis of Montebello and the son of the Duke of Paliano a refuge in Naples. The circumstance that he had persisted in leaving Vargas, the faithful friend of the Carafa, in spite of the strong wishes of the Pope, in his position as ambassador in Rome, was calculated to dispel any suspicion that he had been acting in concert with Pius IV.[2]

The Spanish king proved equally sagacious in the delicate question as to what was to be done with the possessions of the condemned men; the same cannot be said of the attitude adopted by Pius IV. with regard to this matter.

As the Carafa had been condemned to death, not only for the murder of the Duchess of Paliano, but also expressly for high treason and felony, their inheritance fell to the Apostolic Camera. Justifying his action on this fact, the Pope seized for his nephews, not only the movable goods of the Carafa, but also their claims in law. Paliano was only to be handed over to the Colonna when Philip II. had granted to the Pope's nephews the same annual revenues as had formerly been promised to the Carafa! Philip at first made difficulties; he demanded the immediate enfeoffment of Colonna, and wished the sums paid to the relatives of Pius IV. to be treated as a favour, but in no sense as an obligation imposed upon him by any agreement. This painful affair, in which Pius IV. appears as an only too greatly interested party, was not settled until the spring of 1562.[1] After the Pope's nephews had been satisfied, the restoration of Paliano to the Colonna took place on July 17th, 1562,[2] and it remained henceforth in their hands.[3] The former political power, however, of the family had disappeared, and their wealth had also been seriously diminished. In order to enable Marcantonio to liquidate the immense burden of debt which he found in existence, the Pope dissolved for him the entail, with the result that Nemi was sold to the Piccolomini, Città Lavinia and Ardea to the Cesarini, and Capranica, Ceciliano, Pisciano and S. Vito to the Massimi.[4]

---

[1] See RAYNALDUS, 1561, n. 81. *Cf.* *Acta consist. Cancell., VIII., on May 9, 1561, and Acta consist. Cam., IX. 42 (Consistorial Archives of the Vatican).

[2] See HILLIGER, 18.

"An unheard of affair, and an example of Divine justice that one should always have before one's eyes"—so wrote Seripando in his journal after he had heard of the execution of the Carafa.[5] The scandalous administration of the family during the period of their unlimited power under Paul IV., was still so fresh in the memory of the people, that many thought no punishment could be too severe, while they shut their eyes to the injustice and tyranny which had been displayed during the trial, and the political interests and the personal hatred which had played their part in it. Pius IV. himself, does not appear to have realized that, conducted by such bitter enemies of the Carafa as Federicis and Pallantieri, the trial was bound to be of a thoroughly prejudiced character. Onofrio Panvinio[6] relates that Pius IV. had himself said to him that nothing in his whole life had been so difficult for him, or had saddened him so much, as this sentence of death; he would gladly have shown mercy had this been possible without breaking the laws, or if there had been any hope that the Carafa would change their manner of life. Finally, the Pope added that he had also been obliged to show severity in order to give a warning to the relatives of future Popes, so that they might not misuse their great position as the Carafa had done. The explanations which Pius IV. gave to the Imperial ambassador on March 14th, 1561,[1] and which he again repeated later, as in the consistory on June 8th, 1565, and again a few months before his death, on October 12th, 1565,[2] are in accordance with Panvinio's statement.

---

[1] *Cf.* Šusta, Kurie, I., 206 *seq.*, 287 *seq.*, II., 423 *seq.*; Ancel, Disgrâce, 164 *seq.*

[2] See Gori, Archivio, II., 315., Atti Mod., 3., Ser. II. (1883), 152 *seq.*

[3] *Cf.* Tomassetti in the Arch. d. Soc. Rom., XXIX., 336 *seq.*; Campagna, III., 551 *seq.*

[4] *Cf.* Reumont, Beiträge, V., 95, 103 and Rom. III., 2, 541.

[5] Merkle, II., 464.

[6] Vita Pii IV. (*cf.* Appendix No. 37). Compare with this the brief in Raynaldus, 1561, n. 80, and the *letter to the Viceroy of Naples, dated April 13, 1561, in which, in connection with the release of Cardinal Alfonso, it says of the other Carafa: "Molestissimum tulimus, in aliis nimiam atrocitatem criminum et divini honoris ac iustitiae zelum obstitisse." (Papal Secret Archives).

The manner in which Pius IV. justified himself for his action against the Carafa can be clearly seen from these explanations. He wished, not only to punish their crimes, but also to stigmatize the whole system. The judgment of March 3rd, 1561, was a deadly blow aimed at that form of nepotism which consisted in founding principalities; it condemned not only the Carafa, but also the Borgia, Medici and Farnese. There was now an end to the elevation of the Pope's relatives to the rank of sovereign princes. The founding of such states for the Papal nephews had only too often poisoned the political activity of the Holy See since the time of Sixtus IV., and had paralysed its efforts for reform. Paul IV., after he had learned during the last years of his reign to what nepotism might lead, had banished the nephews whom his successor had now destroyed. This was of inestimable value for the success of the Catholic reformation. The warning was efficacious.[3]

---

[1] See SICKEL, Konzil, 184.

[2] Concerning the explanations of October see ANCEL, Disgrâce, 168 *seq.*; those of June 8, 1565, hitherto unknown, in the *Acta consist. card. Gambarae, Corsini Library, Rome, 40—G—13.

[3] A medal of Pius IV. bears the inscription: "Discite iustitiam moniti" (BONANNI, I., 274). Concerning the effects of the tragedy of the Carafa on the letterati see ANCEL, Disgrâce, 159, n. 4. To this belongs the *Capitolo in rima per l' esecuzione dei Carafa, in Cod. 1151 of the Trivulzi Library at Milan.

From this time forward the efforts of the Papal relatives were limited to securing riches, honours, and great positions, and to becoming the equals of the old noble Roman families. This weakened form of nepotism was, of course, grave enough, but it was, nevertheless, far less dangerous for the Church.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* RANKE, Päpste, I., 209; DÖLLINGER, Kirche und Kirchen, 524, 528; FELTEN in the Freiburger Kirchenlexikon, IX., 135, and especially ANCEL, 182 *seq.* Ancel (p. 158, n. 3) quotes the opinion pronounced by Saraceni on March 7, 1561: "Et ancho si vede aperta una strada non più usata da dugenti anni in quà, cioè di rivedere i conti a nipoti di Papi." *Cf.* also the statements in the *Avvisi di Roma of June 8, 1560, and March 8, 1561, Vatican Library (see Appendix No. 7 and 18).

CHAPTER V.

NEGOTIATIONS FOR THE REOPENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

THE most important, as well as the most difficult task which the election capitulation had imposed on the new Pope was the question of the Council, the means by which a stand was to be made against the divisions in the faith and the abuses in ecclesiastical affairs. It was not yet decided whether the Council, which had been suspended in 1552, should be continued, or a new one convoked, nor had anything been decided as to the time and place of meeting. It was not advisable to raise all these critical questions prematurely, and it was therefore considered sufficient to give expression, in general terms, to the desire of the best elements in the Church.

As to the question whether the Council of Trent should be continued or a new one convoked, the most conflicting views were held. While the Protestants, without exception, demanded that everything that had been decided hitherto should be revoked, and matters gone into again from the beginning, strict Catholics insisted, very logically, that the dogmatic decrees already issued were unchangeable and irrevocable, as were the canons of all other ecumenical councils. The latter view, which was represented most strongly among the secular powers by Philip II., was at first shared by the Emperor, Ferdinand I. He, however, allowed himself to be led away, later on, by consideration for the Protestants, and he took up their claim as his own. The French government acted in a similar manner, because their position with respect to the Huguenots was very similar to that of Ferdinand towards the German Protestants.[1] Pius

---

[1] See EHSES, Schlussakt des Konzils, 43 *seq.*

IV. had, therefore, to be prepared beforehand for the gravest difficulties. In spite of this he was quite ready to give effect to the intentions of those who had elected him, with regard to the matter of the council. Only a few days after his election, on December 31st, 1559, he declared to the Imperial ambassador, Francis von Thurm, that it was his desire speedily to summon a general Council.[1] He also insisted on his determination to do so to the Cardinals, in a Congregation on January 4th, 1560.[2] He solemnly confirmed and renewed the election capitulation in a bull of January 12th.[3] The appointment of a reform commission of fourteen Cardinals, of which Angelo Massarelli was made the secretary.[4] clearly showed the wishes of the Pope with regard to the principal task of the Council. Pacheco reports to the Spanish king, as early as January 18th, that it was also the Pope's intention to confirm the earlier decrees of the Council of Trent.[5]

The principal difficulty, now as on former occasions, was to secure unanimity of opinion among the most powerful Catholic rulers, the Emperor and the Kings of France and Spain, before the assembly of the Council.

The attitude of the Emperor, Ferdinand, at first gave reason to hope for the best. His ambassador extraordinary, Count Scipione d'Arco, who arrived in Rome in February, was commissioned to raise the question of the Council.[6] Arco obeyed his orders, but at the ceremony of the *obedientia* on February 17th, 1560, he kept silence on this crucial matter, plainly out of consideration for the attitude adopted by the Protestant princes at the Imperial Diet of the preceding year.[1] Pius IV. expressed his wish to summon the Council to the Spanish ambassador, Vargas, over and over again. "He repeatedly proposes to do so," wrote Vargas on February 25th, "and yesterday he assured me in the presence of eight Cardinals, that as soon as Your Majesty, the Emperor, and the King of France were of one mind on this matter, he would decide as to the time and place." In this conversation the Pope also gave the assurance that he was not thinking of holding the Council in Rome, but in some suitable place whither the heretics could come, so that their want of goodwill could be plainly seen if they did not accept the invitation.[2] At the *obedientia* ceremony on March 9th, 1560, of the envoy of the Polish King, Adam Konarski, Prior of Posen, Pius IV. remarked that he was thinking of summoning the Council, and he spoke still more plainly in the consistory of March 15th, when the embassy of the seven Catholic Swiss Cantons made their *obedientia*.[3]

---

[1] Francis von Thurm to the Emperor on January 1, 1560, in Sickel, Konzil, 23.

[2] See the *reports of Pacheco and Vargas to Philip II., of January 7 and 9 (Simancas Archives) used by Voss, 15.

[3] Raynaldus, 1559, n. 38. Le Plat, IV., 613 *seqq.* Complete in the *Regest. Vat. 1918, in Ehses, Concil., VIII., 2 *seq.*

[4] Massarelli in Merkle, II., 343. *Cf. supra* Chapter II.

[5] Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 328.

[6] *Cf.* Sickel, Konzil, 38 *seqq.*

Obstacles on the part of Spain and France seemed all the less likely as those powers had already adopted an article concerning the Council at the peace of Cateau-Cambrésis, in April, 1559. At the beginning of 1560 Philip II. raised the question of the Council at the French court, where it was well received.[4] When, however, the actual realization of the matter was taken in hand, the widely divergent political views and aims of the Catholic princes, and the conflict between the actual or supposed interests of the state with those of religion, became clearly apparent.

Even in the case of that power which was purely Catholic, and uninflenced by domestic religious differences, even in the case of Spain, the interests of the Church occupied, at first, by no means the first place. It could not escape a keen observer that Philip II., whose policy was above all directed to procuring and preserving peace, feared fresh complications from a general council. He was afraid that the peace, which had only recently been concluded at Cateau-Cambrésis, might be endangered, and Elizabeth of England so embittered against him that he might lose the position of arbiter between England and France in the Scottish question. The bringing forward, therefore, of the matter, did not appear opportune to the Spanish court, though, as the king was dependent on the good-will of the Pope in several other matters, he was exceedingly careful, at all events not to thwart him in the matter of the Council; at the same time, however, he showed no zeal for that important question, but, on the contrary, his efforts were directed to delaying any decision with regard to it, as long as possible.[1]

---

[1] See Hist. Jahrb., XIV., 22 *seq.*, and Ehses, Berufung des Konzils, 2.

[2] See the report of Vargas, in Voss, 16.

[3] See Ehses, Berufung, 2-3. The reply of Pius IV. to the representative of the King of Poland is also in Cod. 73, p. 223, in the Library of the Monastery of Ossegg.

[4] *Cf.* Voss, 17, 19 *seqq.* Concerning the articles of peace, *cf.* Gachard, Corresp. de Marguerite, I., 172.

This attitude of reserve on the part of the most important power in Europe must have warned the Pope to move very cautiously. The Bishop of Terracina, Ottaviano Raverta, when he was sent as nuncio to Spain on March 11th, 1560, was simply commissioned to invite the king to support the Pope in once again convoking the Council.[2] Hosius, who was sent to Vienna as nuncio at the end of March,[3] was instructed to preserve an attitude of reserve in the matter of the Council. The Pope wished indeed to hold a General Council, but he could do nothing in the matter until the French and Spanish ambassadors had expressed themselves with regard to it.[4] Vargas informed Philip II. on April 8th that the Pope had openly declared that he intended to hold a Council, and that he would proceed with its promulgation as soon as the Emperor, France and Spain were of one mind concerning it. On April 26th Francis von Thurm reported to the Emperor that he understood from trustworthy sources that the Pope would reopen and continue the Council at Trent, and that money was already being collected to ensure the carrying into effect of its future deliberations. The ambassador further states that Cardinals Morone and Madruzzo had begged him to ask the Emperor to urge on the Pope in the matter, and that he had replied that His Majesty had already done so through Count Arco, and that he himself would omit nothing that pertained to his office.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* the exposition by Voss, 24 *seqq.*, and especially that of DEMBIŃSKI, Ryzm, I., 151. See also EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 3.

[2] See *Varia polit., 116, p. 380a, Papal Secret Archives. *Cf.* HINOJOSA, 112 *seq.*; EHSES, *loc. cit.*, and Concil., VIII., 10 *seq.*

[3] Concerning the powers conferred on Hosius see the account of MERGENTHEIM, I., 244-7.

[4] Hosius had accordingly not spoken with the Emperor about the Council until the beginning of May (*cf.* Voss, 30, 34). He did not do so until May 10 (*cf.* his report of May 13, in STEINHERZ,

On May 2nd, Jean Babou de la Bourdaisière, the brother of the French ambassador, made his *obedientia* in the name of Francis II. In his reply the Pope remarked that he had wished to hold the Council since the beginning of his reign, and that he now proposed to convoke it in the immediate future.[2] He was soon led to adopt a more decided attitude,

---

I., 23 *seqq.*). The expression used by the Pope to the Polish envoy has not the meaning which Voss (p. 30) attributes to it; it does not prove that the Pope's first zeal for the Council had "gone to sleep" for the clause "si opus videbitur" does not appear in the brief to the King of Poland, of March 22 (THEINER, Monumenta Poloniae, II., 597). The supposition of Voss that Pius IV. had only occasionally shown an outward zeal, is not in keeping with the Pope's continued efforts. Besides this, Voss contradicts himself when he writes on p. 32: "The only thing that was still done in Rome on the matter of the Council was that they did not let it quite go to sleep." DEMBIŃSKI (Ryzm, I., 31) is of opinion that, not only did Pius IV. not wish to evade the Council, but that he had already had it in mind before the question of the French national council arose. For a criticism of Voss see also SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 111 n.

[1] See Voss, 33; SICKEL, Konzil, 40, and especially EHSES, *loc. cit.*

[2] RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 24. LE PLAT, IV., 624. DEMBIŃSKI, Ryzm, I., 255. Voss, 33. EHSES, VIII., 16. *Cf.* BONDONUS, 534. An *Avviso di Roma of May 4, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 153,

in the direction of a more speedy convocation of a General Council of the Church, being moved to this course by the disclosures which were made to him concerning the grave complications which had arisen in conditions in France. The decision of the French Council of State to convene a kind of national council of the members of the Gallican Church on December 10th, was reported to the Pope by Antonio Vacca. This decision was calculated to cause the greatest displeasure in Rome. The Popes had at all times, and with justice, considered a national council as quite inadequate for the removal of dogmatic disputes, and as being full of danger, on account of the risk of schism. Pius IV. feared that, in view of the ferment then going on in France, and the leanings towards a national Church which prevailed there, such an assembly might lead to the falling away of that country from its obedience to the Holy See; besides this, there was the fact that the assembling of a General Council would thereby be rendered much more difficult. The Bishop of Viterbo, Sebastiano Gualterio, who was sent to France in the middle of May as the new nuncio, and who had previously filled that office in the latter days of Julius III., received strict instructions to prevent the assembly of the French clergy, and to declare that the Pope wished for a General Council.[1]

How very much the Pope was alarmed at the danger threatening in France, and how it forced him to act in a decisive manner with regard to the Council without waiting any longer for the opinion of the powers, is clear from the reports of Mula, the Venetian ambassador in Rome. The Pope declared to him in the most definite terms on May 27th, that he was resolved to prevent the French national council by convoking a General Council, and that he intended

---

Vatican Library) mentions the congregation of 12 Cardinals which deliberated about the Council, after the ceremony of the *obedientia*.

[1] See Ehses, Berufung des Konzils, 4 *seq*. *Cf*. the *letter of Mula of May 25, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna), and Ehses, VIII., 20 *seq*.

to bring the matter before the Cardinals in a few days time, at a consistory, and that he would then acquaint the ambassadors with his decision. The suspension must be removed, and the Council of Trent continued. He desired to carry on the work of reform, even as to his own person and his own affairs, but also to safeguard the interests of the faith and of the Holy See. The Papal supremacy must not be infringed, but he was not disinclined to grant reasonable claims. Mula was specially instructed to make secret inquiries in Venice as to whether the government of the Republic would be prepared, in case of need, to place a suitable city in their territory, as for example Vicenza, at his disposal for the meeting of the Council.[1]

The declarations made by Pius IV. in the consistory on May 29th were to a similar effect; two days later he again spoke on the subject to the Venetian ambassador, and amplified his previous statements. The Council, he said, should undertake the necessary work of reform, including his, the Pope's, own affairs, with complete freedom. In order that this freedom might be assured, it must not assemble at any place which, directly or indirectly, belonged to the States of the Church, but neither must it meet in the territory of heretics, where the bishops would not be in safety.[2]

Pius IV. addressed himself to Ferdinand I. and Philip II. in similar terms, and the instructions of Borromeo on May 25th and 26th, 1560, to the nuncios in Vienna and Madrid, had a very determined sound. The Pope, it is stated in the letter to Hosius, will anticipate the French national council by continuing the Council of Trent, which was only suspended, but never closed. Vargas, the representative of Philip II., received a similar declaration.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* the full *account of Mula of May 27, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna, and Papal Secret Archives), from which REIMANN (Unterhandlungen, 595) was the first to quote a passage. See also EHSES, VIII., 28.

[2] *Cf.* Mula's report of May 31, in REIMANN, *loc. cit.*; EHSES, VIII., 28. See also DEMBIŃSKI, Ryzm, I., 35 *seq.*

The solemn meeting of the ambassadors in the presence of the Pope, which had been announced, took place on June 3rd, 1560. The ambassador of the Emperor, and the representatives of Spain, Portugal, Florence and Venice, were present; the Polish envoy was absent on account of illness, as was the representative of France, on account of a dispute about precedence with the envoy of Philip II. The Pope's declaration struck a note that was as definite as could be: "We wish for the Council, We wish for it emphatically, and We wish it to be both free and general; did We not wish for it, the world would delay it for three or four years, on account of the difficulties as to the place. In order to avoid all disputes as to the place and the manner of holding the Council, it is best to continue it in Trent; later on it can be transferred, if necessary, to another and more suitable place, but it is impossible to spend more time in conferring upon that question now, for the progress of heresy, in almost every country of Christendom, makes immediate action necessary." The envoys might make this decision known to their princes by express messenger, and call upon them for their support. They have already been informed of it by the Pope, but have not yet answered. Should the Pope, contrary to his expectations, meet with no response from the princes, his decision would nevertheless remain unaltered, especially as France was pushing forward a national council. In any case, he hoped for favourable replies, and also that the German princes would be present; he believed he could take it for granted that the Margrave of Brandenburg would attend. "Whatever is decided upon by the Council," the Pope concluded, "your princes must assist us in carrying out. We wish the Council to meet as soon as possible, and shall only wait for the replies of your princes before announcing it publicly, and sending the legates."[1]

---

[1] The letter of Borromeo to O. Raverta in DEMBIŃSKI, I., 257 *seq.*, that to Hosius in STEINHERZ, I., 36; the declaration to Vargas in his report of May 25, in VOSS, 44. *Cf.* also EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 6 and VIII., 27.

The desire of Pius IV. to carry this important matter through, with the agreement of the Catholic powers, was thoroughly justified, for the Holy See would require strong support during the Council, while the help of the civil powers would be necessary later on, for the carrying into effect of the measures decided upon.

The first satisfactory answer came from the Spanish government. Philip II. had postponed a decision in his reply to the nuncio, Raverta, even as late as April 1st. At the beginning of May he yielded so far as to express his approval of the convocation of the Council, but only on the condition that the Emperor should also approve. It was only when further news arrived from Rome and France that Philip finally resolved, in a plenary meeting of his privy council, to accept the Council unconditionally. Three days later he wrote to Vargas in Rome that, since a national council was being threatened in France, a thing which might have the gravest consequences, he gave his approval to the decision of the Pope to hold a general council. The agreement of France and the Emperor, however, was necessary. He was glad that the Pope would continue the Council at Trent, but the reform of abuses would have to be undertaken.[2]

The answer of the French government was much less satisfactory, for the continuation of the Council was not at all in conformity with its policy. On June 20th Francis II. sent the Abbot of Manne to Rome,[1] who was to say that the King of France quite approved in principle of the decision of the Pope to summon a General Council, but that he must pronounce against its being held again at Trent, or being regarded as a continuation of the suspended Council, which had formerly been held there. The general assembly of the Church must on the contrary be convoked anew, and in a place to which one could feel sure that the Emperor and all the estates of the Empire, Protestant as well as Catholic, could repair. The opinion of the Emperor must be ascertained, to which the King of Spain must also submit himself. As everything depended on the calming of Germany, the French government recommended Constance in particular. The Abbot of Manne was also instructed to give tranquillizing assurances regarding the plan of a national council. He was, at the same time, to let it be understood that the prospect of such an assembly could only be given up if the Pope should proceed without delay to convene a general council in the sense desired by the French king.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* the report of Francis von Thurm to the Emperor of June 3, 1560, in SICKEL, Konzil, 48, and *that of Mula on the same date, used by REIMANN, *loc. cit.*, 594 *seq.* Reimann rightly notes that "Pius IV. took the first step, from which it is evident that he was in earnest," and that MOCENIGO (p. 25) is unjust to the Pope when he doubts his sincerity. See also DEMBIŃSKI, Ryzm, I., 37 *seq.* *Cf.* also the *letter of G. B. Ricasoli of June 3, 1560 (State Archives, Florence), and the report of the Portuguese ambassador of June 12, 1560, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., VIII., 464 *seq.* See also the account in EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 6 *seq.*, and VIII., 29.

[2] *Cf.* VOSS, 47 *seq.*, 49 *seq.*, 51 ; EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 7.

The Emperor Ferdinand I. had only given a general answer to the nuncio, Hosius, when the latter had first opened the subject of the Council on May 10th, reserving for a later date a decision as to the time and place. When the nuncio, after having received his instructions of May 18th,[3] again approached the Emperor on June 3rd upon this important subject, he once more received an evasive reply. According to his report of June 5th, Hosius seems nevertheless to have received the impression that Ferdinand was agreeable that the Council, after the removal of the suspension, should again be summoned to Trent.[1]

---

[1] See the report of G. Michiel in DEMBIŃSKI, *loc. cit.*, 254. *Cf.* BROWN, VII., n. 174; EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 11.

[2] Instruttione del Rè Christ^{mo} portata a N.S^{re} dall' abbate di Manna sopra le cose del concilio, 1560 (Inf. polit., VII., 424 *seq.*, Royal Library, Berlin), printed in EHSES, VIII., 35 *seq.* *Cf.* REIMANN, Unterhandlungen, 601; VOSS, 54 *seq.*; EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 11.

[3] Printed in CYPRIANUS, 76, and STEINHERZ, I., 31 *seq.*

On the same day the privy council assembled at Vienna in order to come to a final decision upon the matter.[2] Two Austrian statesmen, Georg Gienger, and the vice-chancellor of the Empire, Sigmund Seld, had the chief influence there, and they, like the great number of the Catholic estates of the Empire, held the false view that the decrees of Constance and Basle, which were inimical to the Pope, were lawful and valid, and that a reform of the Church could only be possible on this basis.[3] The Emperor's councillors, as well as Duke Albert of Bavaria, who arrived in Vienna on June 8th, succeeded in making the most of a threatened invasion of the Imperial dominions by the Protestants, in order to prevent the Council desired by the Pope. Under the pressure of this threat, Ferdinand became more hesitating than ever. He who had encouraged the Pope in March, through Scipione d'Arco, to summon the Council as quickly as possible, now, when Pius IV. wished to proceed energetically with the matter, did everything to keep him back. He gave his approval to a memorandum,[4] drawn up by Gienger, to be handed to the nuncio, which made so many reservations, and set up so many claims, which were, in part at any rate, quite impossible of fulfilment, that the proposal of Pius IV. seemed to be altogether negatived.[1]

---

[1] See STEINHERZ, I., 40 *seq.*

[2] Consultatio quid agendum sit in negocio concilii, in SICKEL, Konzil, 49 *seq.* *Cf.* EDER, I., 38 *seq.*

[3] *Cf.* RITTER, I., 146; EDER, I., 36 *seq.* The attack, in the otherwise thorough work of Eder, published in 1911, upon Janssen for a false account of the character of Gienger, is obsolete, for the passage in question was corrected by me in 1896 in the 15th and 16th editions of the IVth volume.

[4] Scriptum C. M^{tis} in negocio concilii nuncio apostolico exhibitum, in SICKEL, Konzil, 55-69, and EHSES, VIII., 39-51. *Cf.* REIMANN, Unterhandlungen, 596 *seq.*; VOSS, 58 *seq.*; EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 9; EDER, I., 43-7. Eder rightly contends against Kassowitz (p. 1 *seq.*) that Gienger was the author.

In the introduction to this very comprehensive document, indeed, the Emperor approves of the Pope's decision, and he declares himself anxious for its immediate fulfilment. He then, however, goes on to explain that on account of the importance of the matter, and the differences of opinion among the Christian princes, a period of at least a year would be necessary for the preparation of the Council. The objections and difficulties, on the solution of which a successful issue depended, were set forth under six heads :

1. The war between France and England must be brought to an end, as general peace among the Christian princes is necessary for the holding and carrying out of a General Council.

2. The Pope must see that all the Christian powers, not only Spain, France, Portugal, Scotland, Poland and Venice, but also such kingdoms as have already fallen away from the Church, such as Denmark, Sweden, and England, are represented at the Council, and that all shall obtain a hearing. Stress is especially laid upon the difficulty of obtaining the participation of the Protestants, whose onerous conditions, drawn up at the Imperial Diet at Augsburg in 1559, are appended for general information. Forcible proceedings against the Protestants are not advisable, but the Emperor promises to do everything in his power to induce them to take part in the Council.

3. The personal attendance of the Pope, whose absence was very prejudicial to the former assembly at Trent, is stated to be essential.

4. Doubts are expressed as to whether Trent should be chosen as the seat of the Council. The town is too small, and since the beginning of the schism a Council has always been needed in German territory. The most suitable place of all would be Cologne, and after that Ratisbon or Constance.

---

[1] The opinion of STEIHNERZ I., lxvii. *Cf.* EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 10.

5. The Protestants declare that they were treated too severely and harshly at the Council of Trent; they did not receive the letter of safe-conduct in the desired form, and were not listened to sufficiently. As their participation can be obtained in no other way, all their wishes in this respect must be granted.

6. Great difficulties were created by the Pope's intention of continuing the former Council by removing the suspension. As far as the Emperor personally is concerned, he has not the slightest idea of calling in question the decrees drawn up by the Council, but a difficulty in the way of a continuation is the fact that the Protestants intend to place the matters already dealt with upon the agenda, and various Christian princes—the allusion is to France—will not acknowledge the former assembly as a General Council. Finally, reference is made to the fact that, instead of the two years for which the Council was suspended, eight have already elapsed.

Therefore, "as it is very evident how difficult the convocation of the Council is, as its progress must be slow, its results uncertain, and the carrying out of its decrees attended with much greater danger than was formerly the case," the Emperor advises the Pope to have recourse to other means for the preservation of the Catholic faith, and the prevention of further defections. As such he would propose, before summoning a Council, a thorough reform of the clergy, and, in the meantime, to allow the laity the use of the chalice, and to give priests permission to marry.

To this document was attached a memorandum which once more briefly recapitulated the attitude of the Emperor towards the plan of the Council, and limited the concession of the chalice to the laity, and the marriage of priests to Germany. These two documents were handed to Hosius on June 20th.[1] In the negotiations that followed, the latter proved himself by no means capable of fulfilling his duties. It would have been easy to show[2] that the realization of several of the Emperor's requirements, such as the establishment of a general peace, and the participation of all the Christian powers, was really not in the Pope's power, and that others, such as the discussion anew with the Protestants of points of dogma, which had already been defined in a general council, meant nothing less than the overthrow of the Church; none of these points, however, were put forward by Hosius. His misgivings only concerned points of minor importance, such as several strong phrases or modes of expression, certain false arguments, the quotations from Scripture in favour of the marriage of priests, and in general the theological and biblical proofs upon which the proposed concessions were based. The Imperial statesmen made no difficulty about taking into consideration objections which left the essential points of the memorandum untouched.[1] The document, altered in the sense demanded by Hosius, was handed to the nuncio by the Emperor on June 26th, and sent by the former on June 28th to Rome, where it arrived on the evening of July 12th.[2] The Imperial ambassador in Rome, Count Prospero d'Arco, also received a copy of the document, as did Philip II. of Spain.[3]

---

[1] See Hosius to Borromeo, June 21, 1560, in STEINHERZ, I., 54 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* STEINHERZ, I., lxiii.

The replies of the three principal Catholic powers arrived in Rome in the course of July, 1560. The Abbot of Manne was the first to deliver his letter, which he had received on July 4th. On July 10th Vargas and Tendilla presented the reply from their sovereign, dated June 18th. Pius IV. expressed to the Spanish envoys his great joy at the decision of Philip II., in whom alone he had perfect confidence, and at the same time acquainted them with the answer of the French government. The Pope complained that the French, although they spoke of a general council, obviously did not want one. Their intention was to gain time by heaping up difficulties and making promises, so that eventually they might hold the national council they had spoken of.[1] The Pope laid the answers of the French and Spanish governments before the Congregation of Cardinals as early as July 11th.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* Steinherz, I., lxxi, 55, 63; Bucholtz, IX., 678 *seq.*; Sickeo, Konzil, 70 *seq.*; Eder, I., 50 *seq.*

[2] See Ehses, *loc. cit.*, 9.

[3] See Sickel, Konzil, 71 *seq*, 73 *seq.*

On July 14th the Imperial ambassador, Prospero d'Arco, had an audience in order to submit the views and requirements of Ferdinand, which had recently arrived from Vienna, to the Pope. The latter, who had already, as a Cardinal during the conclave, made known his inclination to grant concessions with regard to the chalice for the laity and the marriage of priests,[3] again showed himself on this occasion not disinclined to make such concessions, at the same time, however, expressing his doubts as to whether much would be gained by such a course. Such permissions, without the decision of a Council, also appeared to him to be of doubtful value, because difficulties might arise in consequence of them at the Council, and others might feel that they too could ask for further concessions independently of a Council.[4] The Congregation of Cardinals, to which the Pope had submitted the Emperor's reply of July 15th, also declared that the chalice for the laity and the marriage of priests could only be granted by the Council. Arco, who reports this, adds that the removal of the suspension of the Council of Trent is definitely wished for in Rome, and that he has it on good authority that if the Emperor agrees to this, the Pope will give him an assurance that the wished for concessions shall be made.[5] Vargas reported to Philip II. to the same effect on July 16th, and recommended his sovereign to adopt the same attitude. He thought that Ferdinand I. and Francis II. would give way later on, and represent to their subjects that the Pope had acted in the matter without their agreement. Pius IV., however, was not to be prevailed upon to come to a final decision without having an understanding with the two princes in question. He intended, before he did anything, to send Delfino as ambassador to the Emperor, to write to France, and to confer on the whole matter with Spain.[1]

---

[1] See Corresp. de Babou de la Bourdaisière, 9; Vargas in DÖLLINGER Beitrâge, I., 337 *seq.* Voss, 65 *seq.* Giov. Franc. Canobio had brought to Rome the letter of June 18; see BROWN, VII., n. 172-3.

[2] See SICKEL, Konzil, 86 n. *Cf.* the *report of Mula of July 12, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna, and Papal Secret Archives); *Avviso di Roma of July 13, 1560 (Urb. 1039, p. 181, Vatican Library).

[3] *Cf. supra* p. 33.

[4] See Arco's report of July 15, 1560, in SICKEL, Konzil, 84 *seq.* *Cf.* Voss, 67.

[5] See SICKEL, 85. If Arco further declared that in that case the Pope would also allow that they should treat with the Protestants upon the "cose determinate in Trento" he was certainly not right.

This policy, upon which Pius IV. decided, affords another proof of his shrewdness as a statesman. In view of the critical position of the Church, he wished, above all things, to avoid any conflict with the great Catholic powers, and from this came his dread of cutting the Gordian knot. In order to bring about the assembly of the Council, in spite of all difficulties, he was most careful not to give offence to the princes, upon whom, in the first instance, everything depended, by any definite decision, or by too great plainness of speech. However firmly he was convinced of the necessity of a General Council, he nevertheless let as little as possible be known of the character of the new assembly, while he especially endeavoured to evade the important question of the validity of the decrees already issued. If he expressed himself on this point in different terms to the French ambassador from those he used to the representative of Spain, this did not mean that his opinion on this essential matter was not firm and clear, but that he desired to offend neither the one nor the other by making a categorical pronouncement; the powers were intended to receive the impression that he was ready to meet their wishes as far as possible. Even where he could make no concessions, as a matter of principle, he wished, at any rate in outward form, to accommodate himself as far as he could, to the claims made upon him.[2]

---

[1] Vargas' *letter on July 16 (Simancas Archives) used by Voss, 67 *seq.*

[2] See the excellent account in DEMBIŃSKI, Ryzm, I., 31-3.

Pius IV. spoke most openly to Philip II., whose views really approached his own most closely. Prospero Santa Croce, who had been appointed nuncio in Portugal, was entrusted with the negotiations, and left Rome in the middle of July, 1560.

His instructions about the Council,[1] contained, besides a number of other commissions, the following points : He was first of all to express to Philip II. the exceeding joy of His Holiness at the royal letter of June 18th, and at the same time hand him copies of the very unsatisfactory answers of Ferdinand I. and Francis II. The instructions emphasize the fact that, in spite of this, the Pope held firmly to his decision, and admonish Philip II. to do the same. To summon the Council elsewhere than at Trent must delay the opening and cause the canons already framed by the Council to be called in question. As far as the other requests of the Emperor are concerned, the Pope has no intention of granting the concessions asked for without the authority of a General Council.

The replies to Francis II. and Ferdinand I., whose requests were, at any rate in part, impossible of fulfilment, were somewhat delayed, owing to an illness of the Pope. The first was handed in the middle of August to the Abbot of Manne, who returned home a week later. In this the Pope declares that he adheres to his determination to come to the help of the miseries of Christendom by a General Council of the Church, and that as soon as possible. Trent seemed to be the best place for this, especially in the interests of a speedy opening ; the Pope, however, would make no difficulty, after the Council was opened, about removing it, if necessary, to some other city which was safe and not under the suspicion of heresy. The King of Spain agreed to the removal of the suspension, and the continuation of the Council, and would use his influence with the Emperor in this sense. The Pope hoped that the king would do the same, and, under the existing conditions, no longer contemplate a national council.[1]

---

[1] Original minute in the *Varia polit., 117, p. 365 *seq.* (Papal Secret Archives), printed in the Miscell. di storia Ital., V., 1013 *seq.*, and in part in LAEMMER, Melet., 177 *seq.* *Cf.* Voss, 68, n. 128 ; DEMBIŃSKI, I., 158 *seq.*, and EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 8 and VIII., 52 *seq.*

Zaccaria Delfino, Bishop of Lesina, a very skilful diplomatist, and a great favourite at the court of Vienna, who was well acquainted with conditions in Germany from earlier days, was entrusted with the difficult and most important task of winning over the Emperor to the views of the Pope. His appointment as nuncio to Ferdinand I. had already been made in July, but his actual mission was so long delayed that he only left Rome on September 2nd, and arrived in Vienna on the 28th.[2]

The Pope's answer to the Imperial memorandum of June 26th, which Delfino took with him, bears the date of August 30th.[3] In this Pius IV. declares, in very decided terms, his wish again to assemble the Council at Trent, notwithstanding the objections raised by the Emperor. In matters of religion, he says, one must proceed without secondary aims; it was manifest in Germany that negotiations for reunion, prompted by temporal considerations, had always resulted in the infliction of grave injury on religion, as well as on Germany herself. The Council must therefore be opened without hesitation, and with the sole purpose of helping the Church to regain her former position. The Emperor's doubts and objections are then dealt with one by one. The war between England and France is at an end. Whether the Pope will be present in person at the Council is a matter for his own judgment. The Protestants who appeared at Trent would have no grounds for complaint; they would receive safe-conduct in the most sure and complete form, and would be listened to most willingly. The suspension of 1552 had only been effected in order to await the end of the war; as universal peace now prevailed, the Council could again come into being. The objection that Trent was unequal to the task of providing the necessary maintenance and accommodation was also disposed of. The Emperor must realize that, in the places which he proposed, it would be in the power of every reckless prince to suppress the Council, but at Trent this would be impossible. His Majesty must also remember that Trent had been formerly approved of by all the Christian princes, including himself, as a suitable place for the meeting of the Council, and that those who now raised doubts in his mind had no other object in view than to prevent the continuation of the Council. An earnest admonition then follows, which implores Ferdinand to consider the present state of affairs, and above all the conditions in France, which require a speedy assembly of the Council, and to agree, without taking into consideration any personal advantage, but for the honour of God and the well-being of the nations, to the convocation of a General Council of the Church at Trent. This would also be in the interests of the concessions which he desired, concerning the chalice for the laity and the marriage of priests. In conclusion, as in the answer to France, reference is made to the possible subsequent removal of the Council to some safe place which is not under suspicion of heresy.

---

[1] See SICKEL, Konzil, 88 *seq.*; Corresp. de Babou de la Bourdaisière, 19 *seq.*; VOSS, 73 *seq*; ; EHSES, VIII., 55 *seq.* According to the *report of G. B. Ricasoli of August 9, 1560, the reply to France was read on the 8 in the "Congregatione della riforma" (State Archives, Florence).

[2] See STEINHERZ, I., 98 *seq.* *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 92 *seq.*; EDER, I., 55.

[3] Printed in RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 56; LE PLAT IV., 633 *seqq.*; EHSES, VIII., 59 *seq.* *Cf.* VOSS, 75 *seq.*; STEINHERZ, I., lxxix *seq.* The corresponding letter of advice of August 31 in SICKEL, 92.

Delfino is commissioned, in the very detailed instructions which were given to him, and which were certainly drawn up by Morone,[1] to explain more fully the Pope's answer to the Imperial memorandum. The nuncio is to point out, with regard to ecclesiastical reform, that the Pope has taken it in hand himself, but is also pleased that it shall be dealt with in the Council; he will be willing to submit himself to it, should anything which calls for reform be found in his own person. If these interior and religious reasons have no effect, then the nuncio is to point out to the Emperor how very much it is to his own advantage, even on political grounds, and especially in order to secure the succession to the Imperial dignity for his son Maximilian, that he should agree to the holding of the Council at Trent. Should all these considerations have no effect, then Delfino is to declare that, in view of the dangers which threatened the Church at that time, not only in Germany, but also in other lands, and especially in France, the Pope must summon a Council. His Majesty should, also, in the event of its being held elsewhere than in Trent, at least send his ambassadors and the bishops to it. In the extreme case of the Emperor obstinately refusing Trent or any of the places in Italy, and maintaining his demand for reforms and concessions, Delfino is instructed to propose that an assembly of bishops and theologians should deliberate on these questions in Rome.

---

[1] Printed in Pogiani Epist., II., 130, and also in STEINHERZ, I., 100 *seq.*; *cf. ibid.*, lxxx *seq.*; EDER, I., 56. Voss (p. 76 *seq.*) is wrong in doubting the sincerity of Pius IV.

Prospero Santa Croce, who was detained by illness at Avignon, was not able to reach Toledo before August 26th; two days later he had an audience with Philip II., who was pleased to receive the communication of the nuncio, and declared that he was prepared to send Antonio de Toledo to France, to exhort Francis II. to give up the idea of a national council.[1] Toledo left the Spanish court as early as September 4th, with instructions, dated on the 2nd, to the effect that he was to make energetic representations at the French court in favour of a General Council, and to oppose a national one, as being injurious and prejudicial to the interests of Christianity. Philip II. informed the Pope of this step in an autograph letter of September 14th.[2]

---

[1] Santa Croce's report, dated Toledo, August 28, 1560, in the Miscell. di storia Ital., V., 1034 *seq.* *Cf.* LAEMMER, Melet., 180 *seq.* See also BROWN, VII., n. 194, and EHSES, VIII., 59.

[2] *Cf.* LAEMMER, 181 *seq.;* Miscell. di storia Ital., V., 1045; PALLAVICINI, 14, 16, 8-10; VOSS, 82 *seq.;* EHSES, VIII., 63 *seqq.*

This intervention on the part of Spain, however, did not succeed in bringing about a change in the policy of France. The Abbot of Manne had arrived at the French court on September 8th with the Pope's reply. A royal edict of September 10th, 1560, definitely summoned a national council for January 10th, 1561. Antonio de Toledo, who reached the French court on September 20th, found himself faced by an accomplished fact; he returned as early as September 27th. The answer of Francis II. which he took back to his sovereign, renewed, in courteous terms, the previous demands of France, and especially the refusal of Trent.[1]

The news which in the meantime had arrived in Rome from France, had occasioned increasing uneasiness. At first the Pope still hoped to gain something by complaisance, and declared himself ready to summon the Council, if necessary, to Vercelli, so as to make it possible to hold it more quickly.[2] When, however, letters from Cardinal Tournon announced on September 21st the convention of the French national council for January 10th, 1561, Pius IV. felt himself obliged to take decisive measures.[3] On September 22nd he conferred with the Cardinals,[4] and on the following day he summoned the ambassadors, with the exception of the representative of France,[1] to meet him, and then he communicated to them the news he had received from Tournon, and declared that he was now obliged to remove the suspension of the Council of Trent, without making any reference to the validity or non-validity of the decrees already issued. Should Trent not prove a suitable place, the Council could be moved later on to Vicenza, Mantua, or Monferrato. Although he wished to deal with those who had fallen away from the faith in a mild and friendly manner, they must not be suffered to issue commands to the Holy See in such a matter, but must be prepared to receive them from him. The ambassadors were instructed to communicate this to their princes, and to exhort them to support the Pope. Prospero d'Arco, the representative of the Emperor, was the only one to raise objections, but the Pope rebuked him sternly, and the others acquiesced in a greater or lesser degree.[2] In accordance with this decision a new commission was sent by Cardinal Borromeo to the nuncio, Delfino, on September 24th, by which he was to induce the Emperor to agree to the removal of the suspension of the Council of Trent.[3] Pius IV. on the same day sternly reproached the French ambassador, Bourdaisière, for the attitude of France. He promised, however, at the ambassador's request, to wait for another fortnight or month, until Francis II. should have spoken to Cardinal Tournon, and conferred further with him.[4] The Pope gave the Imperial ambassador, Arco, on September 25th, the calming assurance that nothing but necessity had forced him to his declaration of the 23rd. If the Emperor thought that he could procure a delay of the national council from France until he had found out the views of the Protestants, he would alter his decision in accordance with his wishes.[1] As a report was current that the Pope would remove the suspension without waiting for the answers of the princes, Pius IV., in reply to a question from Count Arco, assured him that he had not altered his intention of waiting until the Emperor and the other princes had answered. He again declared himself ready to transfer the Council to another place, if His Majesty so desired.[2] On September 29th the Pope revealed his intention of summoning the Council in any case by his decision to postpone the enforcement of the duty of residence on the part of the bishops, in view of their participation in the General Council.[3]

---

[1] *Cf.* PARIS, Négociat., 544 *seq.*, 594 *seq.*, 615 *seq.*; LE PLAT, IV., 650 *seq.*; VOSS, 82 *seqq.*, 87 *seqq.*; EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 13 *seq.*, 15, and VIII., 72 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* VOSS, 96 *seq.*; *ibid.* for Pius IV's endeavours for reform at that time, especially with regard to the residence of the bishops. *Cf.* Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 347 *seq.*; LAEMMER, Melet., 212 *seq.* and the *reports of G. B. Ricasoli of September 2, 4, 12, and 13, 1560 (State Archives, Florence); the bull *de residentia episcoporum* of September 4, 1560, in the Bull. Rom., VII., 55 *seq.* Concerning the anxiety in Rome *cf.* also the report of the Portguese ambassador of August 22, 1560, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 33, 35.

[3] The proceedings in France, in the opinion of REIMANN (Hist. Zeitsch, XXX, 29) "must have vexed the Curia."

[4] It was proposed to send Tournon to the French court, to give as much help there as he could; but he was not to appear as legate. VOSS, 98; EHSES, VIII., 58 n. 5. *Cf. ibid.*, 71 *seq.* the letter of Pius IV. to Tournon.

---

[1] On account of the dispute about precedence with the Spanish ambassador.

[2] See Arco's report of September 24, in SICKEL, Konzil, 95 *seq.*, and the supplementary report of Vargas of the 25, in Voss, 98-9.

[3] STEINHERZ, I., 115.

[4] See Voss, 101-2.

Philip II. of Spain, in contrast to the policy of the Imperial and French courts, demanded, not only in a general way that the Council should be promulgated, and held as a continuation of that formerly assembled at Trent, but also, in a special way, that the decrees already published at Trent should be declared to be binding. In consideration of the views held by the other princes, however, the Pope did not think it advisable to make the situation still more difficult in this way by any express declaration. In order, however, that no doubts as to his own good will in the matter should arise in Spain, he informed the king, in a confidential letter of October 5th, that he had often considered this question, and had at last come to the conclusion that it would be best, when summoning the Council, neither to confirm the former decrees, nor to declare them invalid, but rather to pass lightly over this question with merely a few general references to it. To tranquillize Philip he told him that he personally considered the Council of Trent as good and holy, and that he especially approved of the decree on justification, and that he would also declare this at a consistory.[4] On the same October 5th, the Pope received Philip's letter of September 14th, through Vargas, with the news of the mission of Antonio de Toledo to France. On the following day he praised the king's good will in a Congregation of Cardinals, and once more emphasized the necessity of speedily summoning the Council. As almost all the Cardinals agreed to the continuation, it was resolved to announce the removal of the suspension on the First Sunday in Advent, to appoint the legates and to decide upon the Festival of Easter as the day of opening. Morone and Seripando were chosen as the probable legates.[1]

---

[1] See the postscript to Arco's report of September 24 in SICKEL, Konzil, 96.

[2] See Arco's report of October 5, in SICKEL, 97 *seq.*

[3] See Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 348.

[4] The *letter of Pius IV. of October 5, in the Simancas Archives, used for the first time by VOSS, 101. *Cf.* the letter of Borromeo to the nuncio in Spain, in EHSES, VIII., 78 *seq.*

Shortly after this, during the night between October 8th and 9th, the news of the non-success of Toledo's mission reached Rome. Vargas, who had an audience immediately afterwards, announces that he found the Pope much depressed, even though he had scarcely expected anything else. Pius IV. said to Vargas: "As the French national council is now definitely decided upon, I for my part will now delay no longer in summoning the General Council. I no longer count on France, and believe that the Emperor will continue to hold back, from fear of complications in Germany. The Spanish king is my only support. I shall therefore request his agreement to the opening of the Council in Trent, as a continuation of the former assembly there; it might then later on be removed to a more suitable place, such as His Majesty would approve. I hope that after the opening the Emperor and others who still hesitate, will give their adherence." In a later conversation with Vargas on October 10th, the Pope declared that he would address an autograph letter to Philip II. This letter, dated October 11th, declared his unalterable determination to proceed to the continuation of the Council of Trent; it was at once taken to Spain by Gherio, Bishop of Ischia, together with that of October 5th.[1]

---

[1] See the report of Vargas in Voss, 101 *seq.*, where the erroneous account by Sarpi is corrected. *Cf.* also the letter of the Portuguese ambassador on October 8, 1560, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 48 *seq.* Morone had already been appointed as legate at the beginning of June, 1560; see the report of Vargas in Voss, 45, n. 89.

On October 13th, the Pope also informed the French ambassador that he was firmly resolved to continue the Council of Trent, and on the same day he discussed the matter in the congregation of Cardinals, who almost all voted for the plan of opening the synod by the removal of the suspension.[2] Pius IV. declared to the Imperial ambassador on October 14th that he could not delay the removal of the suspension later than St. Martin's day; he anxiously awaited the answers of the Emperor and of the Kings of Spain and France before that date.[3]

It has been justly remarked[4] how striking a fact it was that a person of such sanguine character as Pius IV. should, in spite of all resistance, have held firmly to his plan of continuing the Council of Trent. His high dignity, as the first ruler of Christendom, seemed, as it were, to raise Pius IV. above himself. It gave him the strength to carry through the great task without wavering, in spite of all the difficulties which presented themselves. The Council could no longer remain unfinished; it must be brought to a close, if the Church were not to suffer the gravest injury.

The representatives of the Pope at the court of Philip II., Prospero Santa Croce and the nuncio, Ottaviano Raverta, made an official communication to the Spanish king on October 24th, to the effect that the Pope, after serious consideration, had resolved to lose no more time in the matter of the Council. After he had convinced himself that the Emperor and the King of France could not be induced to agree to the removal of the suspension of the Council of Trent, he wished to order it without any further delay, or to remove it to some other city, either in Italy, in the dominions of His Majesty, or in those of his allies, and in this he begged the king to support him. Philip praised the Pope's zeal, and in general terms declared his readiness to do so ; the final answer was to be given to the nuncios in three or four days time. In the meantime, the Spanish king laid the matter before an assembly of theologians for discussion. The latter were, as Santa Croce learned, of various opinions ; some spoke in favour of removing the suspension, and others for a new convocation of the Council. On October 28th, the Duke of Alba addressed the question to the nuncios, whether the Pope would prefer to remove the suspension or to summon a new Council, and whether he would agree to Besançon as its place of assembly. The nuncios, however, could give no definite answer on these two points.[1]

---

[1] See Voss, 102 *seq.*; Ehses, Berufung des Konzils, 15-16, and VIII., 86.

[2] See Corresp. de Babou de la Bourdaisière, 45; Sickel, Konzil, 116 *seq.* Corresp. of Card. O. Truchsess, 215, and the report in Ehses, VIII., 88.

[3] See Arco's report of October 15, 1560, in Sickel, Konzil, 104.

[4] Voss, 104.

This change of front in the Spanish policy was the result of consideration for France, after steps had again been taken by the French ambassador to Spain, the Bishop of Limoges, to come to an agreement on the matter of the Council. Philip II. in his reply to the latter on October 30th, promised that he would intercede with the Pope, so that the Council should be convoked at once, and immediately after it had assembled be removed to Besançon or Vercelli. This decision of the Spanish king was then handed to the nuncios by Alba on October 31st.[2] On November 10th, Gherio left the Spanish court for Rome, with an autograph letter from Philip II. to Pius IV., in which the king agreed to the continuation of the Council of Trent, and did not show himself averse to its subsequent removal ; if this course were decided upon, he proposed Besançon as a suitable place. In a letter to Vargas, written at the same time, he declared that he could only agree if, for the time being, all reference to the validity of the former decrees of Trent were avoided.[3]

---

[1] See the report of Santa Croce of October 31, 1560, in LAEMMER, Melet., 182 *seq.* ; EHSES, VIII., 92 *seq.*

[2] *Cf. ibid.*, 183 *seq.* Concerning the secret correspondence of the nuncios with Rome, which, according to the wish of Philip II. should have ceased, see VOSS, 110 *seq.* As to this, *cf.* EHSES, VIII., 93, and 118 in the notes.

[3] See VOSS, 111.

Zaccaria Delfino, who had been entrusted with the mission to Ferdinand I., arrived in Vienna on September 28th, and was received in audience by the Emperor on the following day. Ferdinand greeted him as an old friend,[1] but did not show himself inclined to deviate in any essential point from his demands. He defined his standpoint in a written reply to the Pope,[2] which was expressed, indeed, in polite and submissive terms, but in reality made no advances. Now, as before, he persisted in his claim that the Council must be convoked as a new one, while he still maintained his objections to Trent as the place of assembly. Although, for his own part, he had nothing to urge against a continuation at Trent, he did this out of consideration for the Protestants, who otherwise could not be induced to take part in the Council, and also on account of those powers, such as France, who did not accept the previous assembly, or had not been represented at it. In connection with his expression of satisfaction at the Pope's reform work in Rome, the Emperor, in conclusion, recalled the concessions which he desired with regard to the chalice for the laity and the marriage of priests. It is true that he declared that he was also convinced that these points could best be dealt with at a General Council, but in view of the many difficulties which in the meantime stood in the way of its convocation, he again recommended the consideration of these concessions to His Holiness.

On October 8th the Emperor received the report of his ambassador in Rome concerning the declaration made by the Pope on September 23rd. At the same time Borromeo's instructions to Delfino of September 24th arrived, whereupon the latter immediately requested an audience for Hosius and himself. Both nuncios appeared before the Emperor on October 9th, when they declared to him the Pope's resolve to remove the suspension of the Council of Trent, and called upon him for his support. Ferdinand handed them his written answer to the Pope, adding thereto a declaration concerning the whole question of the Council, which was couched in vigorous and decided terms. He then pointed out that he gave no orders to the Pope, but only wished to fulfil his duty as Emperor, when he put forward his views on such important matters. As far as he personally was concerned he was prepared to accept any decision of the Pope, but he could not fail to say clearly and distinctly to His Holiness that, in the event of the continuation of the Council of Trent, the participation of the Protestants could in no circumstances be counted on, and that they would even rise up in arms against it. As France and the other powers also refused to accept the continuation, the difficulties of Christendom could only be removed by the convocation of a new Council, to which the Pope was, moreover, bound by the decisions of the Council of Constance. He wished to support this good work, and left the question of the time to His Holiness ; as far as he himself was concerned, he was quite agreeable to Trent, which place was very convenient for him, but as this name was hated in Germany, he proposed Innsbruck. The Emperor also referred to the necessity for the personal attendance of the Pope at the Council. Finally he expressed his astonishment that the work of reform in Rome was so slow, and carried out with so little thoroughness ; he also especially touched upon the abuses in the appointment of Cardinals, by which he referred to the decisions of the Council of Basle.[1] The satisfaction expressed in the memorandum at the Pope's zeal for reform was, therefore, already forgotten !

---

[1] *Cf.* the report of Delfino and Hosius, dated Vienna, October 3, 1560, in STEINHERZ, I., 123 *seq.*

[2] Text first published from the papers of Staphylus by SCHELHORN, Amoenit., II., 479 *seq.*, then in LE PLAT, IV., 637 *seqq.*, and from the Papal Secret Archives by EHSES, VIII., 79 *seqq.* *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 98 *seq.*; REIMANN, Unterhandlungen, 609; VOSS, 115 *seq.*; STEINHERZ, I., lxxxiii *seq.*; EDER, I., 58; EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 18.

---

[1] Concerning the audience of October 9, two reports were sent to Borromeo on October 14 and 15, one from Delfino, and the other from Delfino and Hosius together (see STEINHERZ, I., 132 *seq.*, 135 *seq*). *Cf.* also the instructions of Ferdinand I. to Arco of October 18, 1560, in SICKEL, Konzils, 109 *seq.* See EDER, I., 60 *seq.* Concerning the delivery of the Emperor's speech and the author of the instruction. Eder comes to the following conclusion : The influence of the Spanish Franciscan, Francisco di

The nuncios could at any rate conclude from these significant declarations of Ferdinand, that if the Pope should finally decide in favour of Trent, he would not oppose him. If Delfino, however, thought that the Emperor, in spite of his strong opposition to the continuation of the Council, would leave the Pope a free hand in this respect, he was taking a much too optimistic view.

In Rome, this view was not shared. On the arrival of the Emperor's answer, Congregations were held on October 27th and 28th, in which, an unusual occurrence, almost all the Cardinals took part. At these deliberations a great divergence of views became apparent. Several very highly respected Cardinals, especially Carpi, as well as Cesi, Puteo and Saraceni, spoke very decidedly in favour of the continuation of the Council of Trent, and against the convocation of a new Council. They were able to put forward weighty reasons for their opinion ; in the event of a new Council being summoned, it was to be feared that the whole of the work accomplished at Trent would be lost, while should the decisions of Trent be called in question, the same might be done with regard to the decrees of previous Councils, and the consequences would be incalculable.[1] With regard to the German Protestants,

---

Cordova, the confessor of the wife of Maximilian II. " is certain in the part about ecclesiastical reform (from about *exinde ventum* to *evenit Caraffis*). The preceding part cannot be definitely shown to have come from him, nor can his influence be admitted in the part that refers to the new convocation of the Council."

[1] The Portuguese ambassador also pointed out this danger in a letter of August 22, 1560 ; see Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 33. On November 23, 1560, Hosius wrote to Commendone from Vienna : *Si salva nihilominus remanerent concilii Tridentini sub Paulo et Julio tertiis habita decreta, non multum, quin etiam nihil referre putarem, indiceretur concilium an continuaretur, sed si quid latet insidiarum in verbo indictionis, etiam atque etiam diligenter considerandum censerem ac omni cura providendum, ne sic indicatur concilium, ut omnis conciliorum authoritas elevata vidiatur (Graziani Library, Città di Castello).

it was of no importance whether the Council were described, in accordance with the Emperor's wishes, as a completely new one, since they had repeatedly declared, and most recently at the Diet of Augsburg in 1559, that they would acknowledge no assembly of the Church which was summoned by the Pope.[1] They arrived, however, at no definite decision, and Madruzzo advised them to deliberate further on the matter, to which proposal Pius IV. also agreed.[2]

In the Curia much dissatisfaction was felt at the attitude of Delfino. In a letter from Cardinal Borromeo, of November 2nd, reproaches were made to him that he had expressed the Pope's intentions to the Emperor with too little vigour.[3] Delfino defended himself in a detailed letter on November 17th. On his arrival in Vienna he had found the situation almost hopeless, as the Emperor had been worked upon by France to oppose the continuation of the Council of Trent, and to agree only to its being held at Spires, Constance, or some similar place. He had, however, in a few days, managed to win over Ferdinand to submit to the decision of the Pope with regard to the time and place of the Council, and even to agree to Trent, though he had also proposed Innsbruck. The Emperor, therefore, was not in favour of a new Council, and against a continuation, because he did not acknowledge the assembly at Trent, the decrees of which he personally accepted with all faith, but because he saw that France would not agree, and that Germany threatened to take up arms against it.[1] Delfino allowed it to be plainly seen that, because of these weighty reasons, he approved of the Emperor's point of view, and would recommend it in Rome. In a later letter,[2] he even made proposals in this sense. He said that it would perhaps be well to publish no conciliar bull, but rather four briefs relating to the Council. The first, addressed to the legates of the Council, would contain their appointment and admonish them to listen patiently to everyone, and to treat them in a friendly manner. The prelates would be summoned and invited by a second brief to the Council, which was to be assembled at Trent; in this brief no mention would be made, either of the summoning of a new Council, or of the continuation of the former one; a remark could at the same time be made to the effect that, although the Pope had appointed legates, he would appear in person in so far as his health would allow him to do so. The third brief, to the Emperor Ferdinand and the other Catholic kings and princes, would beg them to support the Council, and prevail upon the German princes to agree to it. Finally, the fourth brief would be addressed to the secular Electors, and "the other princes of the noble German nation who had fallen away from the Catholic faith;" the Pope might say to them that, because of their noble forefathers, who had always been shining lights in Christendom, he could not believe that they would obstinately resist reunion; they should therefore be invited to the Council, with the promise that they should receive safe-conduct, be listened to with great patience, and be treated with every consideration. However, by the time these two letters from Delfino arrived in Rome, the decisive step had already been taken.

---

[1] See Janssen-Pastor, IV.,$^{15-16}$, 19 *seq.*, 135. *Cf.* Reimann, Unterhandlungen, 590.

[2] See Arco's report of October 30, 1560, in Sickel, Konzil, 123, and the letter of Mula of November 1, 1560, Court Library, Vienna (Ehses, VIII., 94). See also the *report of Fr. Tonina of November 2, 1560, Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. *Cf*, Pallavicini, 14, 17, 1; Reimann, *loc. cit.*, 610 *seq.* Seripando had already been summoned by the Pope on October 19, and had conferred with him on the 20, and again on the 30 concerning the Council and reform. Merkle, II., 461-2.

[3] The contents of Borromeo's letter, which no longer exists, may be gathered from Delfino's reply of November 17; *cf.* Steinherz, I., lxxxviii, 157 *seq.*

It had certainly not been without influence in bringing this about that the French court, in consequence of a letter written to the king by Ferdinand, at the instigation of Delfino, had suddenly,[3] on October 14th, given way on the question of the Council. On November 1st, a courier had been sent to Rome with the declaration that France accepted the last proposal to summon the Council at Vercelli, or some other place in Piedmont, and begged the Pope to communicate this to the Emperor and Philip II.; the national council would not be held, but a definite decision of the Pope with regard to a general council must be laid before the States General, which were to assemble on December 10th.[1]

---

[1] See STEINHERZ, *loc. cit.*

[2] Preserved as a supplement to Delfino's letter to Morone of November 18, 1560, in STEINHERZ, I., 162 *seq.*

[3] See EHSES, VIII., 87 *seq.*

After the departure of the courier news arrived from Vienna that the Emperor had given his consent to Trent, and in consequence of this a second messenger was sent on November 2nd to convey to the Pope the agreement of the French government to Trent. Francis II. wrote to the Emperor on November 6th that he would refrain from assembling a national council.[2]

The courier sent by Francis II. on November 1st, reached Rome on November 11th, and the second messenger must have arrived shortly afterwards. On November 14th Cardinal Borromeo wrote to Santa Croce, the nuncio in Spain, "The Emperor and the King of France have decided to agree that the Pope shall hold the Council at Trent, but desire that it should be summoned anew. As the Pope under no circumstances will agree to the Council of Trent or its decrees being invalidated, he is having the question as to whether the convocation shall take place, without prejudice to those decrees, discussed by the Cardinals and other theologians. The bull of convocation will accordingly be drawn up and published in from ten to twelve days time, as is required by our duty to God and the welfare of Christendom; a longer delay is excluded by the occurrences in France and the king's promise to refrain from a national council."[3] At a consistory of November 15th the Pope announced that the princes had agreed to Trent as the seat of the Council, and that the necessary preparations would be undertaken with the consent of the Cardinals. Fasts and intercessory prayers must be ordered for the whole of Christendom, while a special procession and a High Mass at S. Maria sopra Minerva would take place in Rome. Cardinals Saraceni, Puteo and Cicada, together with several other theologians would be entrusted with the drafting of the bull of convocation, and their draft would be laid before the Cardinals in consistory.[1]

---

[1] LE PLAT, IV., 655 *seq.*

[2] See *ibid.*, 657 *seq.*; EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 20 *seq.*, VIII., 97 *seq.*

[3] See EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 21.

The decision so suddenly arrived at, after such long discussion, was soon known in Rome, and caused great astonishment.

The following occurrences clearly showed that they were faced with an accomplished fact. The indulgence which usually preceded the conciliar bull, was published on November 19th, and in this the Pope announced his resolve to summon and continue the General Council, in accordance with the advice, and with the consent of the Cardinals, in the same city of Trent, where his predecessors had already held the Council. Fasts, prayers and alms would be ordered to implore the Divine blessing, and to the faithful who added to these good works a contrite confession and a worthy communion, a plenary indulgence would be granted as in the year of Jubilee.[2]

---

[1] There are two reports of the consistory of November 15: (1) Acta consist. Cancell. printed in RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 67, and LAEMMER, Zur Kirchengeschichte, 73 *seq.;* (2) Acta consist. Cancell. in EHSES, Berufung des Konzils, 21, where there are particulars on the relation between the two accounts. See the text of both in EHSES, VIII., 100. *Cf.* also the letter of Card. O. Truchsess of November 16, in his Correspondence, 222 *seq.*, and the report of Vargas in Voss, 127. EHSES (p. 23 *seq.*) completely rejects the attempt (Voss, 129) to attribute the decisive influence upon the deliberations in the Curia upon the question of the Council to Duke Cosimo I. The matter, however, would bear further investigation according to the documents in the State Archives, Florence.

[2] Concerning the bull of November 15, in which the two contrary expressions *indicere* and *continuare* are simply placed one after

This jubilee was closed by the Pope himself with a solemn procession, which took place on Sunday, November 24th. The grand cortège proceeded from St. Peter's, through the Via de' Banchi, Monte Giordano, and the Piazza della Dogana, to S. Maria sopra Minerva, where the Cardinal Bishop of Porto, Ridolfo Pio di Carpi, celebrated High Mass. In the procession Pius IV. walked barefoot, accompanied by Cardinals Farnese and Santa Fiora, and all the Cardinals then in Rome, twenty-one in number, were also to be seen. The ambassadors first carried the baldachino over the Pope, and afterwards the nobles. All the members of the Curia took part in the procession, as did also the secular and regular clergy, as well as the seventeen secular confraternities of Rome, and the Duke of Florence, who walked between the two junior Cardinal Deacons, Carlo Borromeo and Giovanni de' Medici, his own son.[1] The Roman people showed great piety during the ceremony, and many communicated in order to gain the indulgence.[2]

The publication of the conciliar bull had also been originally intended for November 24th, but its appearance was delayed, as such great differences of opinion had arisen among the Cardinals, canonists and theologians who had been summoned to the conference, among whom was the General of the Jesuits,

---

the other, by which, however, no deception was intended, and still less any solution of the difficulty, see Ehses, Berufung des Konzils, 23. The full text, but with wrong date is in the Corpo. dipl. Portug., IX., 96 *seq.*; also in Ehses, VIII., 100 *seq.*

[1] See Massarelli in Merkle, II., 349; Bondonus, 537; *letter of Fr. Tonina of November 27, 1560 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua) the Portuguese report in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 129. An *Avviso di Roma of November 30 states that Vargas had claimed that in the procession the ambassadors should walk after the bishops and in front of the Cardinals, and that in the end Pius IV. had assigned to the bishops their place behind the balachino. The procession was " bellissima et veramente rara." (Urb. 1039, p. 228b, Vatican Library).

[2] See Bondonus, 537.

Lainez, that violent discussions ensued.[1] In consequence of this, the bull could only be read in consistory on November 29th. Before it was read the Pope made a speech in which he pointed out the necessity of speedy measures in view of the dangerous position of the Church, and the threatened national council in France. After the bull had been read, he explained it, and indicated as the tasks of the General Council the eradication of heresy, the removal of schism, and the reform of the Church. At the end he remarked to Cardinal d'Este that the national council would thus be prevented, to which the Cardinal replied that it was already destroyed.[2]

In the bull of convocation, which bears the date November 29th, 1560,[3] Pius IV. glances back at the history of the Council under his predecessors, Paul III. and Julius III., who had been unable to bring it to an end owing to the difficulties of the times. This account is in such a form as to take it for granted that the former acts of the Council, which had been combatted, partly by the Imperialists and partly by the French, were valid.[4] The Pope then expressed his sorrow at the continued spread of heresy. As the good and merciful God had again granted peace to Christendom, he now hoped to be able to put an end to the great evils of the Church by means of the Council. After having fully deliberated on the matter with the Cardinals, and communicated his decision to the Emperor and the kings and princes, and found them ready to support the holding of the Council, he now summons the holy, ecumenical and general Council to Trent ; it is to be opened there under the repeal of each and every suspension, on Easter Sunday next.[1] The patriarchs, archbishops, and all those who, according to common law, or privilege, or prescriptive law or right, have a seat and vote on the Council, are admonished to appear at Trent on the appointed day. A request is addressed to the Emperor and the other princes, that if it be impossible for them to be present at the Council in person, they shall at least send envoys, and see that the prelates undertake the journey without delay, and are in a position to fulfil their duty.

---

[1] *Cf.* as to this Voss, 131 *seq.*, who uses especially the reports of Vargas. See also the *report of Fr. Tonina of November 23, 1560 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua); further DEMBIŃSKI, Ryzm, I., 220 *seq.*, and GRISAR, Disput., II., 9*.

[2] See Acta consist. in DEMBIŃSKI, *loc. cit.*, 256 *seq.*, and EHSES, VIII., 103. *Cf.* also Tonina's *report of November 30, 1560 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] Printed in RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 69, and more fully in Bull. Rom., VII., 90 *seq.*, and in EHSES, VIII., 103. *Cf.* Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 99 *seq.* A facsimile in SWOBODA, 96.

[4] Pallavicini rightly emphasizes this (14, 17, 6).

On November 30th copies of the bull, with the accompanying brief, were sent to the Catholic princes.[2] On the same date a brief was sent to all the bishops of France, containing an invitation to the Council, a special one being sent to Cardinal Tournon.[3] On Sunday, December 2nd, the bull of convocation was made public, by being read in St. Peter's and the Lateran, and by being affixed in the usual places.[4]

By the words " under repeal of each and every suspension " the bull gives expression to the fact that the Council, in accordance with the will of the Pope, shall be a continuation of the previous assembly at Trent, but out of consideration for the Emperor and for France, this is put in as reserved a way as possible, and with a careful avoidance of the word "continuation."

---

[1] Sacrum oecumenicum et generale concilium . . . in civitate Tridentina ad sanctissimum diem Ressurrectionis dominicae proxime futurum indicimus, et ibi celebrandum sublata suspensione quacumque statuimus et decernimus.

[2] The briefs to the Emperor and Francis II., in RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 70 and 71 ; LE PLAT, IV., 663 *seq.* Besides this brief Pius IV. sent to Ferdinand I. on December 4, 1560, an autograph letter (SICKEL, Konzil, 147). The brief to the King of Portugal in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 107. See also EHSES, VIII., 111 *seq.*

[3] RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 72. LE PLAT, IV., 664 *seq.*

[4] See Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 349 ; BONDONUS, 546. Tonina *reported on December 4, 1560 : " Lunedì fu congregatione sopro questa cosa del concilio, della quale ancorche già sia publicata la bolla . . . stampata et attacata ai muri, nondimeno ancora si disputa fra cardinali il suo tenore essendo sopra quelli alcuni dispiaceri." (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

CHAPTER VI.

THE MISSION OF COMMENDONE AND DELFINO TO GERMANY.

PIUS IV. and his advisers, by their carefully considered and, in various points, intentionally vague wording of the bull of convocation of November 29th, 1560, wished, as far as possible, to avoid giving offence to the powers, and to evade the dangerous controversial question as to the relation existing between the Council now summoned to Trent, and the former assembly held there. Out of consideration for the Emperor and France, the word "continuation" was not used, while, out of consideration for Spain, the convocation of a new Council was not definitely mentioned. As far as principle was concerned, however, nothing was yielded by this; the highly important question of the validity of the previous decrees remained only in apparent abeyance. The basing of the convocation on the historical fact that the Council had already been assembled on two occasions, and not brought to a conclusion, but only adjourned, as well as the use of the significant expression "under repeal of each and every suspension" pointed clearly to a continuation, and let it be seen that a renewed discussion of decrees already promulgated, contrary as it was to Catholic principles, would not be tolerated. On the other hand, the words "We summon a Council" made it possible for the Emperor and France to see therein a concession to their wishes. In this way an attempt was made to do justice to both views, although they were incompatible and irreconcilable.[1]

---

[1] See STEINHERZ, I., 172. REIMANN says: "the bull causes a very high opinion of the skill of the 3 Cardinals and 12 canonists, of whose manifold deliberations it was the result." (Unterhandlungen, 614). *Cf.* also DEMBIŃSKI, Ryzm, I., 228 *seq.*, and EHSES, Schlussakt des Konzils, 45.

The great question was whether the formal concessions adopted by Papal diplomacy, and which attempted to provide a middle course between two powerfully opposed attitudes, would satisfy the great Catholic powers. It was soon evident that this was by no means the case. The long negotiations were again renewed, and repeated missions of nuncios extraordinary became necessary in order to secure the acceptance of the bull and the bringing into being of the Council.

The delivery of the conciliar bull to France was entrusted to the secretary of Cardinal d'Este, Niquet, Abbot of St. Gildas, who had come to Rome on September 24th, 1560, with dispatches from Francis II. to his ambassador, Bourdaisière. When Niquet reached Paris on December 17th, 1560, Francis II. was dead, and his younger brother, Charles IX., then only ten years old, had succeeded him (December 5th, 1560). Affairs of state were now in the hands of the Queen-Mother, Catherine de' Medici, but the change of government had led to no alteration in the question of the Council. People appeared to be glad at the idea of a general council being at last summoned, but objected to the words "under repeal of each and every suspension" and expressed the fear that the Protestants, and, out of consideration for them, the Catholics of Germany as well, would not acknowledge a council which took for granted the validity of the former decrees. It was, however, decided to delay making an answer until the Emperor's attitude could be ascertained. The French ambassador in Vienna, Bochetel, Bishop of Rennes, was instructed to discuss the matter with him. Should Ferdinand not accept the bull, they resolved, in union with him, to demand an alteration from the Pope. In this event, Bourdaisière, the ambassador in Rome, was instructed to act in concert with the representative of the Emperor.[1]

While the French government was raising difficulties because the bull pointed to a continuation of the Council of Trent, the Spanish king was displeased because the continuation was not expressly and clearly proclaimed. Philip II. and his counsellors, in their great zeal for the Catholic faith, feared that Pius IV. might give way still further, and, in order to win over the Protestants, allow a renewed discussion of the decrees already formulated. It was not, however, difficult to satisfy Philip II. on this point. The greatest danger for Pius IV. lay in the possibility of an understanding between the French government and the Emperor, as together they might be able to enforce their will upon him in the matter of the Council.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* LE PLAT, IV., 668 *seq.;* PALLAVICINI, 15, 1, 5 *seq.;* REIMANN, Unterhandlungen, 614 *seq.;* SICKEL, Konzil, 154 n.

As a matter of fact, of all the princes, Ferdinand had the least occasion to make further difficulties, as his request that the continuation of the Council should not be definitely spoken of had been complied with, but the Emperor's constant fear of a sudden attack by the Protestants, which caused him to take quite exaggerated measures to reassure them, prevented him, on this occasion as well, from declaring himself boldly in favour of the Council.[2]

Pius IV. chose Giovanni Commendone, Bishop of Zante, to deliver the bull of convocation to the Emperor, and he was, at the same time, commissioned to announce the Council to the ecclesiastical and secular princes in north Germany, Belgium and the Rhineland, Zaccaria Delfino, Bishop of Lesina, receiving instructions to travel through central and south Germany for the same purpose. In order to publish the invitation to the Council in the widest manner possible, the Pope had thought of allowing his representatives to visit the Protestant princes as well, but by so doing he would expose himself to the danger of offensive refusals, so he comforted himself with the consciousness of having fulfilled his duties as chief pastor.[1]

---

[1] How much the Pope feared this is evident from the *report of Cusano of January 11, 1560 (State Archives, Vienna).

[2] STEINHERZ very justly remarks (I., xci) that nothing was more significant of the anxiety with which Ferdinand I. regarded the Protestants than the fact that he did not wish to publish the indulgence bull of November 15, because there was mention in it of the continuation of the Council.

Giovanni Commendone had begun his diplomatic career under Julius III. and Paul IV., in many missions, and in the office of the Secretary of State. He had also come in contact with that part of north Germany which he was now to visit, when he had accompanied the legates Dandino (1553) and Rebiba (1556).[2] He left Rome on December 11th, 1560,[3] and arrived in Vienna on January 3rd, 1561.[4] He delivered to the Emperor, in addition to the bull of convocation, a brief and an autograph letter from the Pope. The brief contained an invitation to send envoys to the Council, and a request to order the bishops of the Imperial dominions to proceed to Trent. The autograph letter assured him once more that the Germans invited to the Council would be listened to with kindness and charity, and their just demands satisfied.

---

[1] *Cf.* Mula's *report of November 18, 1560 (Court Library, Vienna); SICKEL, Konzil, 149, 148 *seq.*; STEINHERZ, I., 171 *seq.*; EHSES, Ein päpstlicher Nuntius, 39.

[2] *Cf.* Vols. XIII., 149, XIV., 119 of this work.

[3] The day of departure, which was not hitherto known for certain, is given as December 10 in the *Viaggio, mentioned *infra* p. 225 n. 3 (Chigi Library, Rome). As there only exists a copy of this authority, preference must be given to the following statement in Fr. Tonina's *report of December 11, 1560: "Il Commendone è partito hoggi per la corte Ces. con 120 brevi" (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[4] The *Register of the reports of Commendone from Germany, written by Antonio Maria Graziani, is found in the Graziani Archives at Città di Castello, and has been made accessible for the first time by the researches of J. Dengel. Afterwards it was published in part by Steinherz in the 2nd volume of the 2nd section of the Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland. A later copy, already used by PALLAVICINI (15, 2, 5) is in Cod. Barb., 5798 (formerly LXII., 58). *Cf.* also ŠUSTA, Kurie, I., 139, 312, 319. Finazzi has published part of the letters, but with many errors, in the Miscell. di storia Ital., VI., 3 *seqq.* A splendid new edition in EHSES, VIII., n. 80 *seqq.* The *Viaggio in the Chigi Library, Rome, mentioned *infra* p.225 gives details of Commendone's route.

On January 5th, 1561, Commendone, as well as Hosius and Delfino, had an audience with the Emperor.[1] The latter did not conceal his objections to the wording of the Papal briefs, but, nevertheless, declared himself ready to further the Council. He then recommended the nuncios to proceed without delay to the Diet summoned by the Protestant princes for January 24th at Naumburg. He requested to be informed in writing as to what the Pope wished him to communicate to the princes. The nuncios, who had been forbidden to undertake written negotiations, so as to avoid protracted and dangerous correspondence, had scruples about complying with this request. As Ferdinand, however, insisted on having at least Commendone's proposal in writing, they felt bound to give way, so as not to endanger further negotiations. They therefore gave him a note from Commendone, drawn up in the shortest possible terms, to which the Emperor, in his turn, gave a written reply on January 8th. He praised the Pope's resolve to invite the German princes by means of the two nuncios; from the Catholic states of the Empire, and especially from the ecclesiastical ones, he thought that the Pope's representatives would be sure to meet with ready obedience. With regard to the Protestants, he repeated his advice that they should visit the Diet at Naumburg, and exhorted them to act there in a spirit of clemency; he intended himself to send envoys to Naumburg.[2]

There was no possibility of the nuncios seeking fresh instructions as to their course of action from Rome, and as the Emperor's representations were very urgent, they resolved, hoping for subsequent approval, to modify their programme, and to repair together to the Diet of the princes at Naumburg, proceeding afterwards to the legatine districts prescribed to them. At a further meeting on January 12th, the Emperor recommended three further points for their consideration. First, as the Protestant princes looked upon the Council which had been summoned as a continuation of the former one, and were therefore full of suspicion, this suspicion must be removed. Second, it was necessary to act in a very discreet manner when dealing with the Protestants, and to offer them safe-conduct in the widest acceptation of the word. Third, when at Naumburg, they should accommodate themselves to the German usage, and negotiate in writing. To the second point, it was possible for Commendone to agree unconditionally, but to the first he answered that they were not sent to dispute with the Protestants, but only to invite them to the Council, where everyone would be able to speak freely on all points, and would be listened to in the most courteous manner. With regard to the third point, Commendone referred to his instructions, which forbade written negotiations in order to avoid useless disputes.[1]

---

[1] See the report to Borromeo of January 9, 1561; January 9 and 13, 1561, composed by Delfino in the names of Hosius and Commendone as well as himself, in the Miscell. di stor. Ital., VI., 20 *seq.*, in EHSES, VIII., 128, n. 80, 131, n. 82.

[2] The note of the 5, and the Emperor's reply of January 8 in RAYNALDUS, 1561, n. 20, more correctly in PLANCK, Anecdota fasc. 21, and EHSES, VIII., 123 *seq.* *Cf.* REIMANN, Commendone, 241.

On January 9th Ferdinand replied to the brief, and on the 15th to the Pope's letter. Both documents, it is true, gave hopes, in general terms, of his supporting the Council, but threw no light on the Emperor's own intentions.[2] His idea was to make his decision dependent on the answer of the Protestant princes assembled at Naumburg. While he invited the latter, through his envoys, to send delegates to the Council, he at the same time emphasized his firm resolve, under all circumstances, to preserve religious peace.[3]

Commendone and Delfino left Vienna on January 14th; they travelled as quickly as cold and snow permitted, by way of Prague, where they were received by the Archduke

---

[1] See Commendone's report of January 13, 1561, in the Miscell. di stor. Ital. VI., 32 *seq.*, in EHSES, VIII., 131 *seq.* *Cf.* PLANCK, *loc. cit.*; REIMANN, *loc. cit.*

[2] See SICKEL, Konzil, 159 *seq.*

[3] See *ibid.*, 157 *seq.*

Ferdinand, and arrived at Naumburg on January 28th.[1] There, in accordance with their instructions, they endeavoured at first to negotiate with the individual princes separately, but in this they were not successful, and had to make up their minds to appear before all the princes assembled in the Diet. This took place on February 5th.[2] The nuncios first handed to each prince the brief addressed to him, together with a copy of the bull of convocation. They then invited the assembled princes by word of mouth to participate in the General Council. Delfino assured them that the Council would not only, and above all, grant them a hearing, but also all just demands. As there were almost as many opinions concerning religion as there were individuals, and as many gospels as teachers, he begged them to send their envoys to Trent, who would receive safe-conduct in the fullest form, and thus to secure the re-establishment of religious unity. Commendone pointed out that this was the very moment for a Council; peace now reigned between France and Spain, and the present Pope had zealously resolved to abolish all the abuses which had crept into the Church and to restore the weakened ecclesiastical discipline. They must consider that it was a question of the faith and of the salvation of souls; if the foundations of religion were to be destroyed, then the kingdoms would also fall to pieces. The assembled princes desired the nuncios to give them what they had said in writing, but desisted when the latter appealed to their instructions to the contrary.

---

[1] See Commendone's report in the Miscell. di stor. Ital., VI., 42, 45, 50 *seq.*, and the *Viaggio in the Chigi Library, Rome, quoted *infra* 225, n. 3.

[2] *Cf.* the report of Commendone, composed also in Delfino's name, of February 8, 1561, in the Miscell. di stor. Ital., VI., 54 *seq.*, more correctly previously in Pogiani Epist., II., 229 n., and also in Ehses, VIII., 149 *seq.*, and the report of Delfino of February 9, 1561, published by Sickel in the Neuen Mitteilungen des thüringisch-sächsischen Vereins, XII. (1869), 531 *seq.* *Cf.* *ibid.*, a criticism of the reports on the negotiations of the nuncios. Concerning the Diet of the princes at Naumberg see Janssen-Pastor, IV., 15-16, 138 *seq.*

The nuncios had hardly returned to their temporary lodgings when they were subjected to insulting treatment, similar to that which had been shown to the envoys of Paul III. at Schmalkald.[1] Three of the councillors brought back the briefs with the statement that the princes had only remarked the address "Beloved son" after they had gone; as they did not acknowledge the Bishop of Rome as their father, they must reject the appellation of "sons" as well as the documents which had been delivered. The nuncios replied that the Pope had made use of the term which had been used from time immemorial towards all Christian princes. The councillors thereupon laid the briefs upon the table. The bull of convocation, however, which was a much more important document, and brought the Papal authority into prominence in quite another manner than did the conventional address of the briefs, was not among them; the answer to this arrived two days later. It was not merely a rejection, but was couched in rude and offensive terms. The Pope, it stated, had no right to summon a Council, or to pose as a judge in ecclesiastical disputes, as it was precisely he who was the originator of all errors, and who suppressed the truth more than anybody else. The outstanding work of the Popes had been to stir up nation against nation, and to increase their own power by weakening that of the people. They proceeded with cruelty against all those who would not abase themselves to the adoration of their persons and their false deities, yet who wished to live in true piety. Then these very princes who were just then disputing with each other at Naumburg about the true Confession of Augsburg, went on to deny the existence of any religious disunion. They were unjustly accused, they impudently maintained, of not possessing religious unity, yet there was not only their clear confession of faith at Augsburg, which had been handed to the Emperor in 1530, but various other documents which had amplified and spread more widely the true divine doctrine. On the other hand the Roman Church was inundated with errors and abominable abuses, and the Gospel teaching there was so violently distorted, that it resembled heathen idolatry rather than a Christian community. The Electors and princes had been driven by the stern command of God to avoid idolatry, and to separate themselves from the Roman Church, and they were by no means willing to allow the Pope to make laws for them; it was Ferdinand, the Roman Emperor, who alone was their master, and had the right to summon a Council.

---

[1] *Cf.* Vol. XI. of this work, p. 88 *seq.*

Commendone answered this insulting declaration calmly and with dignity: The Pope had summoned the Council in the manner which had always been observed in the Church; the Emperor, to whom the princes ascribed the right to summon a Council had too much discernment not to see the difference between spiritual and temporal authority. The Pope had had his attention fixed upon reform ever since he ascended the throne, and he had summoned the Council all the more gladly as it was precisely in that way that a general reformation could best be undertaken. That divisions and uncertainty of opinion existed among the followers of the new religion was no unjust reproach, but a fact patent to the eyes of the whole world; it was perfectly evident from the writings of their theologians, which had been cited by the princes, and which were full of many new opinions, all contradictory of each other. If the princes maintained that they had certainty in their faith, then the novelty, the deviation from the rest of the Church, the separation from the ordained power, must at anyrate affect this certainty and make them doubtful, especially in a matter where it was a question of eternal salvation or eternal damnation. St. Paul, the vessel of election, who, according to his own testimony, had received his gospel, not from men, but by revelation, yet received by revelation the command to go to Jerusalem and compare his gospel with that of the Apostles, so that he might not run or have already run in vain. Commendone further enjoined the princes to reflect that from the days of the Apostles all the ancient fathers had always turned to the Church of Rome as their teacher and rule of truth; the Germans themselves, as they must acknowledge, had received Christianity from her. They should remember the words of the Gospel: "How often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldest not!"[1]

Although the answer of the princes contained no reply to the invitation of the nuncios, there could yet be no doubt that they rejected the Council. Even Delfino, who comforted himself in his sanguine way, recognized how hostile those assembled at Naumburg were to the Pope, and feared that the other Protestant princes and states would follow their example.[2] On February 11th he and Commendone visited Bishop Julius Pflug, who lived at Zeitz, and who promised to come to Trent. The nuncios separated on February 13th; in spite of their different characters they had got on well together as Venetians. Delfino, in accordance with his instructions, went to south Germany, while Commendone commenced his journey to the north.[3]

---

[1] See REIMANN, Commendone, 247 *seq.*, 273 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* Delfino's letter to Ferdinand I. of February 10, 1561, in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 673 *seq.*; REIMANN, *loc. cit.*, 248.

[3] The principal sources for Commendone's mission are his letters, which are now to be found in a good edition, thanks to the care of EHSES (*cf. supra* p. 219 n. 4). There is also a detailed description of his whole journey from Venice until his return there. This *Viaggio d' Alemagna fatto dal cardinale [sic] Commendone l' anno 1560 [until 1561] scritto da S^{re} Fulgenzio Ruggieri Bolognese et copiato da Giov. Franc. Scardova Bolognese l' anno, 1596, is preserved in Cod. M—I—2, p.p 1-68 in the Chigi Library, Rome. Heidenheimer has published some notes from this in the Korrespondenzblatt der Westdeutschen Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kunst, XXI., 117 *seq.* Trêves, 1902, under the title of "Ein Italiener des 16. Jahrhunderts über Rheinländisches und Westphälisches," but they do not by any means exhaust this source, which is so full of interest for the history of the Church and of civilization (*cf.* PASTOR, Eine ungedruckte Beschreibung der Reichsstadt Aachen aus dem Jahre 1561,

Commendone refrained from visiting Weimar, as Duke John Frederick did not even condescend to give him a direct answer, but merely sent him a message that "he had less than nothing to discuss with the Roman Bishop!" The Elector Augustus of Saxony had provided the nuncios at Naumburg with letters of safe-conduct for his dominions, and expressed his regret that he had not met them in a city belonging to him, but at an assembly for which he had had to show some consideration. Commendone was accordingly politely received at Leipsic by the municipal council and the university, although the whole city was Protestant. From Leipsic he proceeded by Magdeburg to Berlin, which he reached on February 19th, and where he took up his residence for a time. Pius IV. had built great hopes on the Elector Joachim II., as he had made his personal acquaintance many years before during the Turkish war. Joachim[1] acknowledged this circumstance by an almost oppressive amiability

---

verfasst von dem Italiener F. Ruggieri, Aix, 1914). Heidenheimer has also overlooked the fact that a great number of passages had already been published in 1746 and 1756 by LAGOMARSINI, De scriptis invita Minerva II., 16 *seq.*, and in POGIANI Epist., II., 235 *seq.* Lagomarsini erroneously ascribes the itinerary to Graziani. Concerning the account of Germany, drawn up by Commendone after a Venetian model (in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, III., 310 *seq.*) *cf.* ŠUSTA, Kurie, II., 412. Since, of other accounts, the monograph of PRISAC, Die päpstlichen Legaten Commendone und Cappacini in Berlin (Neuss, 1846) contains nothing new, there need only be mentioned REIMANN, Commendone, 250 *seq.*, who (p. 273 *seq.*) contributes a criticism of the articles on the subject in earlier works (Raynaldus, Pallavicini, Gratianus) and the valuable essay of EHSES, Ein papstlicher Nuntius am Rhein, 39 *seq.*

[1] The character sketch of the Prince Elector given by Ruggieri in the *Viaggio mentioned in the previous note is printed in LAGOMARSINI, De scriptis, II., 21; there is also a short description of Berlin at that time. Concerning Brandenburg, Ruggieri says: *Ci sono alcuni frati Franciscani che dicona la messa et i suoi uffitii secretamente in un monasterio, ma ci stanno con gran paura (Chigi Library, Rome, *loc. cit.*).

and hospitality towards the Pope's representative.[1] The cunning Hohenzollern overwhelmed Commendone with marks of attention, assigning him a lodging in the best part of his castle, repeatedly inviting him to his table, and holding long and confidential theological discussions with him. Commendone might well have great hopes that his mission would be successful here, because the Elector received without any difficulty the bull of convocation and the brief addressed to him; the answer, however, which he finally received, although very courteous, amounted to a refusal.[2]

The brother of the Elector, the Margrave John of Brandenburg, whom Commendone, while at Berlin, visited at Beeskow, also received him with great politeness, giving him, however, an answer which was an even more definite rejection than that of Joachim II.[3] The son of the Elector of Brandenburg, Archbishop Sigismund of Magdeburg, to whom Commendone delivered the bull and a brief from the Pope, promised, on the other hand, to come soon to Trent; he would, he said, apply to the Pope with the greatest confidence for advice and help in his ecclesiastical affairs. The prince who thus gave these solemn assurances was already at that time a Protestant in secret, and openly adhered to the Augsburg Confession before the year was out.

Commendone's stay in Berlin came to an end on March 3rd. On his departure Joachim II. handed him a polite answer in writing to the Pope's brief. The Elector, whose marks of attention were continued to the end, also wished to bestow valuable gifts upon the nuncio. Commendone, however, begged him to refrain from doing this, and rather to grant him two other favours, namely to agree to read the controversial work of Hosius, "Confession of the Catholic Faith," and to restore to the poor Carthusian monks, who had still managed to maintain themselves near Frankfort on Oder, some property which had been taken away from them. The Elector promised to grant both requests.

---

[1] See EHSES, Ein Nuntius, 40.

[2] *Cf.* REIMANN, Commendone, 251-9; EHSES, VIII., 171 *seq.*

[3] The reply of John of Brandenburg, dated February 26, 1561, in SICKEL, Konzil, 176 *seq.* The detour to Beeskow took place on February 25; on the 26 Commendone started for Frankfort-on-Oder, returning to Berlin on the 28; see *Viaggio, *loc. cit.*

However greatly Commendone may have appreciated the benevolent frame of mind and the good will of Joachim II. towards a peaceful settlement of the religious disputes, he had no illusions, however, as to the attitude which this prince would adopt with regard to the matter of the Council.[1] The often repeated claims of the Elector that the Protestant theologians should be granted a vote at the ecumenical Council could not, in accordance with Catholic principles, be allowed.

Commendone remained at Wolfenbüttel, with the aged Duke of Brunswick, Henry the Younger, from March 8th till the 13th. This prince, who had remained true to the old faith, declared himself ready to send envoys to Trent.[2] On the 14th Commendone arrived at Hildesheim, where he did not meet the bishop of that place, Burkard von Oberg. The Duke Eric II. of Brunswick and the Bishop of Osnabrück were also absent, so Commendone delivered the Papal invitation to the Council to their councillors. At Paderborn, where Commendone arrived on March 22nd, he at last found a city which still remained entirely Catholic. The bishop, Rembert von Kerssenbrock, promised, in spite of his great age, to attend the Council. Münster was reached on March 26th. In contrast to Paderborn, many had fallen away from the church in the diocese of Münster, which was certainly in consequence of the want of vigilance on the part of the bishops of the district.[3] The metropolitan of that time, Bernhard von Raesfeld, did not appear to show much zeal in the carrying out of his pastoral duties, and his reply was in keeping with his conduct: he endeavoured to excuse himself from going to Trent, on account of the proximity of the Protestants and the disobedience of his subjects.

---

[1] *Cf.* the passages from the letters cited by REIMANN, p. 259, n. 1.

[2] *Cf.* EHSES, VIII., 177.

[3] *Cf.* Ruggieri in the *Viaggio in the Chigi Library, Rome, quoted *supra.* p. 225, n. 3.

On the way to Cologne Commendone touched on the dominions of the Duke of Cleves, where he again found many Lutherans. Things looked better in the territory of the Elector of Cologne, whose capital the nuncio reached at the end of March. There he took up his residence in the Abbey of St. Pantaleon. The nuncio and those who accompanied him were astonished at the number of churches, said to be as many as three hundred, and at the rich treasures of relics which the Rhenish metropolis possessed. The city was not quite free from heresy, but the zeal with which the people frequented the churches made a most favourable impression on the Pope's representative.[1] His original intention, of spending Holy Week in Cologne, and then carrying out his commission, he had to give up on learning that a Diet of the German Electors was to be held at Frankfort on the 20th. He could not fail to take advantage of this favourable opportunity of furthering the matter of the Council, so he immediately repaired to Brühl to see the archbishop, Johann Gebhard of Mansfeld, who was grievously ill. The answer which he received there, however, was very unsatisfactory. In sending this to Cardinal Borromeo, he wrote: "I do not believe that any of the bishops are thinking of coming to Trent. The princes of the other religion do all they can to prevent their appearance there, and in this manner to weaken the authority of the Council."[2]

Commendone visited the Elector of Trêves, Johann von der Leyen, by making a journey to Coblence. The two prelates understood each other very well, and made friends, although, even more strongly than the other bishops, Johann insisted on the impossibility of leaving his people or diocese, in view of the dangerous position of affairs, and the experiences of 1552.[3]

In his conversations with the Archbishop of Trêves, whose diocese still remained entirely Catholic, Commendone spoke with great frankness[1] of the sad experiences he had so far had during his journey through north Germany. "Religious conditions in Germany," he explained, "are in such a state that the application of the remedy must not long be delayed; the longer we hesitate the more difficult and dangerous it will become. The number of the heretics increases from day to day; they have not only won over the greater number of the secular princes, but the territories of the Catholic princes, both ecclesiastical and secular, are so polluted and infected that they can hardly exact service from their subjects, nor the customary taxes and obedience. Still, there is no doubt that the power of the Catholic states of the Empire is greater than that of the Protestants, and nothing causes these last to be so respected and feared as their external unity, though at heart they are much divided, and only united by their common hatred of the Catholic religion, and their greed for the ecclesiastical property that still remains. It is therefore most necessary that the Catholic princes should at once be truly united and on good terms with each other, from which it would become possible to hope for every good, and a happy outcome to the Diet, and even without this the way would be opened to the Council." Johann von der Leyen informed Commendone in confidence of the obstacles which had hitherto frustrated the formation of a Catholic confederation. Commendone, however, adhered firmly to his opinion that, if they did not make up their minds to unite the Catholics, and set them free from their state of fear and subjection, religious affairs would become almost desperate. The Archbishop of Trêves himself does not seem to have been free from this state of fear, as was shown by his pronouncements with regard to the Diet of the Prince Electors and his answer in the matter of the Council, that he could not appear in person at Trent, on account of the certain dangers to which he would expose his territory by his absence.[2]

---

[1] See Ruggieri, *Viaggio, Chigi Library, Rome.

[2] Letter of April 11, 1561, in Ehses, VIII., 18 *seq.*

[3] See Ehses, Ein Nuntius, 41, and VIII., 193 *seq.*

---

[1] *In questo stato sono manco heretici che negl' altri degl' elettori di Colonia et Moguntia et per tutto si vive catolicamente, writes RUGGIERI, *loc. cit.*

[2] See the letters of Commendone of April 14 and 21, 1561, in EHSES, VIII., 191 and 194. *Cf.* REIMANN, Commendone, 261 *seq.*

On April 19th Commendone was once more in Cologne, where he received the visit of the Bishop of Osnabrück, Johann von Hoya. This prelate, whom in other respects Commendone highly praises, also dwelt upon the disturbed state of the country, and the dangers which threatened the bishops who should travel to the Council. He proposed that the archbishops should be commissioned by the Pope to hold provincial synods, and these should appoint several bishops to go to the Council, the other bishops remaining behind for the protection of their own and the other dioceses. Commendone, however, protested against the dangerous and tedious plan of holding provincial synods.

The answer of the municipal council of Cologne, and of the university of that city to the invitation to the Council was satisfactory. Commendone, however, did not conceal from himself the fact that even in Cologne grave dangers threatened the Church. He set great hopes on the Jesuits for averting these dangers, but the latter had to contend with great difficulties in the Rhenish capital, owing to the jealousy of the clergy, and especially of the mendicant orders. The nuncio was much grieved by the incredible apathy of so many Catholics. "It looks," he wrote, "as if our people were those who believe in faith alone without works, so little do they appear to trouble about the redress of the present evil conditions. On the other hand, those who stand outside the truth and can therefore find no real unity, do endeavour to support one another and to give an appearance of being united."[1]

Commendone found conditions much worse than in the archdiocese of Cologne, when he entered the Duchy of Cleves, the capital of which he reached on April 26th. The apostasy from Rome had there made great progress, and there were many heretics in Cleves. The city of Wesel was almost entirely Protestant, at Düsseldorf a declared Protestant was teaching five hundred pupils, and the court preacher gave the people communion under both kinds. Commendone lost no time in remonstrating with Duke William IV., but was very cautious in doing so. This was very necessary, as the Duke was out of temper on account of the hesitation of Pius IV. to grant permission for the foundation of the university at Duisburg.[1] As a change of religion on the part of the Duke of Cleves might have incalculable consequences, on account of the position of his country, Commendone endeavoured to pacify him and advised Rome to make all possible advances.[2] In the matter of the Council, Duke William showed very good will as to the sending of envoys, expressing at the same time the wish that the chalice might be granted to the laity, and permission given to priests to marry.[3]

---

[1] Letters to Borromeo of April 21 and 25, 1561, in EHSES, VIII., 194 *seqq.*

From Cleves, Commendone visited the Netherlands, starting for Utrecht on April 29th, where he arrived on the 30th. Thence he travelled by Dordrecht to Antwerp, which he reached on May 3rd, remaining there until the 12th. Here he received Cardinal Borromeo's instructions that he should also visit the King of Denmark and hand him personally the invitation to the Council.[4] If he should be successful in winning over this prince, the most powerful in the north, who was also related to the two most important courts of the

---

[1] Upon this affair *cf.* ŠUSTA, Kurie, 109 *seq.*

[2] The affair dragged on till 1562. On June 15, 1562, the bull for the erection of the university of Duisburg was sent to the Duke, antedated April 10th; see LACOMBLET, Urkundenbuch, IV., n. 564; ŠUSTA, Kurie, II., 211.

[3] To the accounts already noted, and profitably treated of by REIMANN, Commendone, 264 *seq.*, and LOSSEN, Masius' Briefe, 331 *seq.*, must be added the *Viaggio of Ruggieri, where we read of the religious conditions of the country: *Quanto alla religione il duca non mostra di dissentire in altro della fede cattolica che nella communione sub utraque specie ch' egli riceve apertamente; la sua corte è quasi tutta lutherana. Nei stati si vive per il più alla cattolica, ma per tutti i luoghi sono molto heretici (Chigi Lib., Rome).

[4] *Letter of Borromeo of March 4-7, 1561, Lett. di princ., XXII., 113 (Papal Secret Archives). *Cf.* ŠUSTA, Kurie, I., 199, and EHSES, VIII., 169 *seq.*

German Protestant princes, Brandenburg and Saxony, he would indeed have attained a great deal. In view of the attitude which the Danish sovereign had hitherto taken up, however, there appeared to be very little hope of success. In spite of this Pius IV. did not wish to leave any means untried.

In order to carry out this visit to Denmark, Commendone required special letters of safe-conduct and recommendation from the Emperor, and these could not be obtained very quickly. In the meantime the indefatigable nuncio employed the interval in carrying on further work in the Netherlands to ensure the sending of delegates to the Council. On May 12th he proceeded by Malines and Louvain to Brussels, and during his stay there (May 22nd) carried on negotiations with Margaret, the Governess of the Low Countries, and with Cardinal Granvelle, who both displayed great zeal for the Council. They, however, advised Commendone against the journey to Denmark, as being dangerous to his own person, and not in keeping with the dignity of the Pope. Commendone was, however, of opinion that it was the duty of a servant to carry out unconditionally the orders of his master, and that he should take no thought for his own danger.[1] At Louvain the nuncio had made inquiries concerning the theological controversies which had been stirred up by the professor Michael Baius, who was a lover of innovations; he reported the facts to the Pope, giving him the shrewd advice, which Pius IV. followed, to impose silence on both Baius and his opponents.[2]

In the person of the Bishop of Liège, Robert van Berghen, Commendone made the acquaintance of a prelate who was distinguished both for his learning and piety, and who showed an ardent zeal for the Council, although he was suffering from serious illness. The nuncio left Liège on May 30th. During his stay in Belgium he had also been occupied with the matter of the recently established bishoprics.

---

[1] *Cf.* the letters of Commendone in Ehses, VIII., 205 *seqq.*

[2] *Cf. ibid.*, 221 *seq.*; Pallavicini, 15, 7, 7 *seq.*, 11 *seq.*; Šusta, I., 34 *seq.*, 49 *seq.* The affair of M. Baius will be dealt with later, in its proper place.

In the Imperial city of Aix Commendone confirmed the municipal council and the citizens in their great zeal for the old faith. There was a want of suitable delegates for the Council in the city, and therefore the councillors promised a strict observance of any decrees which should be issued by the Council at Trent.[1]

On June 2nd Commendone left Aix-la-Chapelle on his return journey to Antwerp, where he stayed for three weeks, waiting for news from Rome. On the 24th he started for Amsterdam, from which city he went on to Lübeck, by way of Osnabrück. His stay in this entirely Protestant and very profligate city, which he reached on July 9th, was to last for quite two months, and in the end was to prove altogether useless.

While the councillors at Lübeck were still hesitating whether they should observe the customary rules of diplomatic courtesy towards the representative of the Pope, the Protestant preachers were violently declaiming in their pulpits against the demon who had come to unsettle the consciences of the people and deceive them with the fable of the Council. The municipality at length decided not to take the embassy of Commendone into consideration ;[2] this ill success, however, might have been endured had not the other and much more important mission, to the Danish king, been such a complete failure.

Full of zeal, Commendone had already declared himself willing to deliver the invitation to the Council to King Eric XIV. of Sweden as well. Pius IV., who had originally intended to entrust this task to Canobio, who was destined for Russia, at last decided, on the advice of Hosius, in favour of Commendone. The latter had addressed a letter to the King of Denmark, Frederick II., who had not even condescended to send him a direct reply. The king simply wrote on July 22nd, 1561, to the Imperial commissary, Caspar von Schöneich, who accompanied the nuncio to north Germany, that he refused the representative of the Bishop of Rome, with whom he had no relations, the desired entry into his kingdom.[1]

---

[1] For the stay at Liège and Aix, *cf.* Commendone's letter in Ehses, VIII., 216 *seq.* Ruggieri's report on Aix has been published in the Zeitschrift des Aachener Gesch.-Vereins (*cf. supra* 225 n. 3).

[2] See Ehses, VIII., 233 and 239 *seq.* *Cf.* also Illigens, Gesch. der lubeckischen Kirche (1896), 149 *seq.*

The long expected answer of the King of Sweden, which arrived at the end of August, 1561, not only observed the forms of courtesy, but also from its tone held out some hopes. Eric XIV. excused his delay by saying that he had not been able to decide about his journey to England, but that now that he had made up his mind, he left it to the nuncio either to seek him there, or to wait for his return to Sweden. A safe conduct was attached to the letter.[2]

It was, however, very doubtful whether a journey to England would be possible for Commendone, as Queen Elizabeth had already forbidden Abbot Girolamo Martinengo, who was to take to her the invitation to the Council, to set foot in her dominions.[3]

Commendone decided to return to Antwerp, and there await developments. In the difficulties of his position it was a consolation to him that his friends in Rome, the Jesuits and other religious, were praying for him without ceasing.[4] On September 9th he left Lübeck[5] and travelled by way of

---

[1] Concerning the plan for the mission to the North, *cf.* the letters of Commendone in the Miscell. di stor. Ital., VI., 165, 168, 171 *seq.*, 176 *seq.*, 178 *seq.*, 181 *seq.*, 186 *seq.*, 190 *seq.*, 197 *seq.*, 203 *seq.*; BIAUDET, Commendones legation till Danmark och Sverige, 1561, in FINSKA, Vet. Soc. Förhandlingar, XLVII., No. 18, Helsingfors, 1904-5. The brief to the King of Sweden and Norway of December 5, 1560, in RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 74; LE PLAT, IV., 666. *Cf.* also EHSES, VIII., 117, n. 70.

[2] Miscell. di stor. Ital., VI., 233. EHSES, VIII., 252 n. 2.

[3] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 15, 7, 1-2; REIMANN, Commendone, 271; ŠUSTA, I., 196. *Cf.* Vol. XVI. of this work.

[4] *Cf.* the *letter of C. A. Caligari to Commendone, dated Rome, August 30, 1561, Lett. di princ., XXIII., 32 (Papal Secret Archives).

[5] With the letter dated from Lübeck, September 1, 1561, ends the impression in the Miscell. di stor. Ital., VI., 235. The other

Verden, Osnabrück, Münster, Emmerich and Cleves to Antwerp which he reached on September 26th. While he was waiting for further news there, Eric XIV. gave up his journey to England, as Elizabeth had informed his ambassador that she was not at present disposed to marry. In the middle of November Commendone received in Brussels, where he had been arranging the reorganization of the Belgian bishoprics, orders from Cardinal Borromeo to return to Rome, and on his way to invite Duke Charles II. of Lorraine to the Council.[1] The zeal which the nuncio had displayed in his legation had given universal satisfaction in Rome.[2]

On December 8th Commendone left Brussels and journeyed by way of Mons and Rheims to Nancy, to the court of the young Duke of Lorraine. There he met Cardinal Guise, and conferred with him as to the religious conditions in France and Scotland, which was under the rule of Mary Stuart, the Cardinal's niece. In the matter of the Council, the Duke replied that he would be guided entirely by the Emperor.[3]

Commendone remained at Nancy until January 9th, 1562, when he set out, by way of Metz, Trêves, Coblence and Wiesbaden for Mayence. In this ancient episcopal city he remarked, to his great sorrow, that many Lutherans were endeavouring to undermine the faith of the inhabitants. It was all the greater consolation to him that the Jesuit college, founded a short time before by the Elector, Daniel Brendel, who supported it from his private means, was instructing the young people with great success in the Catholic

letters, in the copy of the register in Cod. Barb. have been used by Šusta, (I., 138, 312, 319) and as far as they relate to the Council have been published by Ehses (VIII., 252 *seq.*).

[1] The letter from Borromeo bears the date October 25, 1561; see Šusta, I., 312. For the return journey see *Viaggio (Chigi Library, Rome), and Ehses, VIII., 257.

[2] So writes G. A. Caligari to Commendone in a *letter from Rome of November 1, 1561, Lett. di princ., XXIII., 41 (Papal Secret Archives).

[3] See Pallavicini, 15, 8, 8. *Cf.* Lagomarsini, De scriptis, II., 82 *seq.*

spirit.[1] On January 31st Commendone left Mayence and proceeded by way of Frankfort and Aschaffenburg to Würzburg. The bishop of that city, Frederick von Wirsberg, honoured the Pope's representative in every possible way; in consequence of his great age, however, he was not in a position to undertake the journey to Trent. From a religious point of view things were not unsatisfactory in the diocese of Würzburg, as the bishop did everything in his power to maintain the people in the Catholic faith. The Catholics were also in the majority in the diocese of Bamberg, which Commendone visited on February 9th; the greater part of the people were Catholics, but the nobles, on the other hand, had gone over to the new doctrines, and because of the unfitness of the bishop, an aggravation of the evil was to be feared in the future.[2]

From Bamberg the nuncio went to Nuremberg, where all Catholic services were forbidden. After that he once again came into Catholic territory. The old church was still unshaken at Eichstätt, Ingoldstadt and Freising, but there was no lack of the innovators, especially in lower Bavaria.[3] Nevertheless, the Catholic attitude of Duke Albert, who heard mass every day, gave reason to hope that no religious upheaval would take place there. When Commendone reached Munich on February 11th, the Duke was at that moment sending an envoy to Pius IV., who was to travel by way of Trent. From

---

[1] *Cf.* HANSEN, Jesuitenorden (1896), 392; DUHR, I., 103 *seq.*; HEIDENHEIMER, *loc. cit.* 119 (see *supra* p. 225, n. 3). As to the Elector whom Commendone visited at Aschaffenburg, *Ruggieri observes that he was good and Catholic, " ma quasi tutta la sua corte è lutherana e massimamente i principali." The passage which LAGOMARSINI (II., 96) cites as coming from Graziani appears to be an extract from Ruggieri.

[2] *Cf.* *RUGGIERI, Viaggio, Chigi Library, Rome; also LAGOMARSINI, II., 96 *seq.*

[3] *Quanto a la religione in tutti i luoghi si celebra la messa et si dicono tutti gli altri uffizii, ma per tutto sono heretici et nel inferior Baviera ce n'è maggior copia. RUGGIERI, *loc. cit.*

Munich Commendone started upon his return journey to the south.[1]

While Commendone was working in the interests of the Council, with skill, moderation, and in a spirit of conciliation, in the northern and western parts of the Empire,[2] his colleague and fellow countryman, Delfino, was showing no less zeal in the legatine district assigned to him.[3] He had left Naumburg in the middle of February, 1561, and had passed through Voightland in Franconia. As an Italian, he suffered a great deal from the unaccustomed climate, the roads being soaked with snow and rain, so that the journey was very difficult, yet in spite of all obstacles, Delfino did everything in his power to proceed quickly. He visited Bamberg first, and then Nuremberg and Würzburg, whence he made a detour to Mergentheim to visit the Grandmaster of the Teutonic Order.[4] He then proceeded by way of Frankfort, to Mayence, Worms, Spires,[5] and at length, at the beginning of May, reached Strasbourg. With regard to the Council, he found opinion generally agreed as to the necessity for such an assembly, but only very few of those who were invited were willing to put in an appearance at Trent. All the bishops, it is true, declared that they would submit to the Council, yet they were averse to the idea of personally undertaking the long journey. Some excused themselves on the ground of ill-health, or the weight of years, others by reason of their poverty, while yet others alleged the dangers to which their absence would expose their dioceses. In the Imperial cities the customary marks of honour were, indeed, shown to the nuncio, but the answers he received were very unsatisfactory, several, especially that of the city of Strasbourg, being a curt refusal.[1] Delfino took the opportunity while he was in Strasbourg, of carrying on negotiations with several Italian Protestants, such as Count Thiene, Dr. Massaria and Girolamo Zanchi, who had sought refuge abroad. The nuncio also had repeated conversations with Vergerio at Strasbourg, Zabern and Schwarzach. All these efforts were without result; as was soon realized in Rome, they were to some extent even dangerous, for Vergerio certainly "only negotiated so as to give vent to his burning hatred against the Papacy, and to forge new weapons against it out of any offers which might be made for his return to the Church."[2]

---

[1] According to *RUGGIERI, *loc. cit.*, Commendone left Munich on February 27, 1562. After he had made a report to the legates of the Council at Trent, he left there on March 15, and arrived at Mestre-Venice on the 17. Commendone's final report to Borromeo of March 8, 1562, is printed in EHSES, VIII., 281 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* the opinion of EHSES, Ein Nuntius, 44.

[3] The sources for Delfino's legation are much less full than those for Commendone; they exist, however, in an excellent edition in STEINHERZ, I., 341-398.

[4] *Cf.* the report of Delfino to Card. E. Gonzaga on March 19, 1561, in STEINHERZ, I., 346. The reply of the council of Nuremberg to Delfino in SICKEL, Konzil, 182 *seq.*

[5] See STEINHERZ, I., 350 *seq.*

From Strasbourg, Delfino travelled by way of Freiburg, to the Bishop of Constance, who resided at Meersburg, and to the Abbot of Weingarten, both of whom declared themselves unable to go to Trent on account of their age. The Bishop of Merseburg, who visited Delfino at Ulm, at the end of May, made his decision dependent on the attitude of the Emperor. The municipal council of Ulm refused to separate themselves from the other adherents of the Confession of Augsburg; these last protested that they longed above all things for the restoration of religious unity, but in view of their own powerlessness could only express their earnest wishes for its realization.[3] The University of Ingoldstadt, on the other hand, promised to send delegates to Trent, as did Duke Albert of Bavaria, whose court at Munich Delfino reached on June 4th. This prince, as Delfino wrote thence to Rome on the 10th, surpassed all others in his zeal for the preservation of the Catholic faith. Delfino also discussed with Albert the religious disunion among the Protestants, and they rightly came to the conclusion that the final settlement of religious differences lay, not with the theologians, but with the princes. Delfino repeated on this occasion, what he had previously insisted upon, that too great hopes for the position of the Catholic Church in Germany must not be built on the dissensions of the Protestants. The position continued to be one of extreme danger, and they must in every way do their utmost to induce some of the Protestants to take part in the Council.[1]

---

[1] The reply of Strasbourg in STEINHERZ, I., 355 *seq.* The brief to Strasbourg of December 13, 1560, in RAYNALDUS, 1560, n. 76; LE PLAT, IV., 666 *seq.*

[2] The opinion of STEINHERZ (I., 368) who treats of this in great detail (I., 266 *seq.*, 277 *seq.*, 292 *seq.*, 294, 312, 320, 333 *seq.*, 345 *seq.*, 356 *seq.*, 367 *seq.*, 374 *seq.*, 394). *Cf.* also HUBERT, 179 *seq.*, and ŠUSTA, I., 29, 39 *seq.*, 96 *seq.*

[3] *Cf.* STEINHERZ, I., 370 *seq.*, 375 *seq.*, and EHSES, VIII., 218 *seq.*

The result of Delfino's mission was, on the whole, no more successful than that of his colleague, Commendone. He had, it is true, received promises from several bishops, but the Protestant Imperial cities had given him nothing but refusals.

In the same way as in Germany, the Protestant Cantons of Switzerland also showed themselves, under various pretexts, unfavourable to the Council. The five Catholic Cantons, on the other hand, to which the Bishop of Como, Gian Antonio Volpi, communicated the conciliar bull, showed themselves ready to be represented at the Council by delegates. In a short time Freiburg, Soleure and Glarus joined the Forest Cantons.[2]

---

[1] See the report to Borromeo on June 10, 1561, in STEINHERZ, I., 395 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* MAYER, I., 37 *seqq.*; REINHARDT-STEFFENS, G. Fr. Bonhomini, introd. p. xxxii *seq.*; EHSES, VIII., 265 *seq.*

CHAPTER VII.

Final Preparations for the Re-opening of the Council.

The attitude of the Emperor towards the question of the Council was of decisive importance. Hosius made the most urgent representations to him, but he could not succeed in obtaining Ferdinand's consent to the conciliar bull. At the end of January, 1561, the Emperor at length gave up at any rate his opposition to the solemn publication of the indulgence in Vienna, whereby he acknowledged in principle the Pope's project for a Council.[1] On February 13th, 1561, however, when the answer of the Protestant princes arrived from Naumburg, the Emperor became more reserved than ever, and took up a still more dilatory attitude. Pius IV. vainly tried, by making concessions in the matter of the visitation of the monasteries, and by sending the Papal chamberlain, Canobio, with the consecrated hat and sword, to bring about a change in his attitude. When Canobio and Hosius were conferring with Ferdinand on February 14th about the acceptance of the bull, he remarked that, personally, he had always agreed, but that he wished the Council to be a success, and to make sure that a war should not arise from its convocation; his care now must be to see that the Catholic bishops should be able to attend the Council without fear; it was his intention to make peace with the Protestant princes if they would promise this to the bishops who were travelling to the Council. Two days later the Emperor again declared to Hosius that he was himself in favour of the Council, but that for the moment he could not promise the appearance of the bishops; he wished, therefore, first to consult the Catholic Electors of the Empire. Hosius answered that there was danger in delay; if the French, tired of waiting, summoned a national council, and went their own way in ecclesiastical matters, the power of the Protestants would thereby be strengthened. Regardless of this, the Emperor persisted in his opinion that he could do nothing until he had conferred upon the subject with the Catholic princes, or at any rate with the ecclesiastical Electors.[1] The continued efforts of Hosius during the following days had no better success, Ferdinand constantly repeating that he must await the answer of the ecclesiastical Electors.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* Eder, I., 72 *seq.*

While these negotiations were taking place, France appeared to have given up her opposition to the conciliar bull. At the beginning of March the Council of State resolved to accept the bull, which fact was communicated to the nuncio, Gualterio, and the envoy extraordinary, Lorenzo Lenzi, Bishop of Fermo. In an official note of March 3rd, which Abbot Niquet was to take to Rome, the participation of France in the Council was, it is true, made dependent on the consent of Ferdinand I. and Philip II.[3]

Before the news of this reached Rome, however, Pius IV. had taken steps to appoint the legates for the Council. In doing this he wished to give unmistakable proof that he was in earnest about the holding of the Council. He had already announced his intention of appointing Morone as a legate at the end of June, 1560.[1] In October a report was current in Rome that Seripando and Gonzaga had been chosen to represent the Pope at the Council, in addition to Morone; the Spanish ambassador, Vargas, was working against Morone and Seripando.[2] At the beginning of December, Morone formally declined the Pope's request;[3] Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga also refused, but on Pius IV. insisting, gave his consent on February 6th.[4] Pius IV. thereupon appointed him and Puteo legates to the Council in the consistory of February 14th, 1561.[5] Three further legates were chosen on March 10th, from among the new Cardinals created on February 26th, namely Seripando, Hosius and Simonetta.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* STEINHERZ, I., xcix, 215 *seq.*; EDER, I., 73.

[2] See STEINHERZ, I., 219 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 221 *seq.*, the report of Hosius to Borromeo of March 3, 1561, concerning his interview with Ferdinand I. on March 2. On the last day of February, 1561, Hosius wrote to Commendone: *Hic nihil est novi hoc tempore. Concilii causa nescio quomodo extrahitur longius. Caes. Maiestas non satis suam sententiam explicat ac prius etiam rem ad principes ecclesiasticos electores praesertim referri vult quam expresse declaret se in concilium consentire. Ego urgere non desino, quantumque periculi sit in mora positum inculco, sed non multum proficio. Quid sit fuurum, Deus scit. On March 11, Hosius wrote to Commendone: *Adhuc Caes. Maiestas deliberat in causa concilii et responsum a catholicis principibus ex Germania expectat (Graziani Archives, Città di Castello).

[3] See ŠUSTA, I., 170; SICKEL, Konzil, 186 n.; EDER, I., 74; EHSES, VIII., 167.

---

[1] See the report of Vargas in Voss, 63.

[2] *Cf.* DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 340 *seq.*, 346 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, I., xlviii *seq.*

[3] See ŠUSTA, I., xlviii.

[4] See *ibid.*, xlviii-xlix. In a *report of Fr. Tonina of January 1, 1561, we read: "Da persona che mi dice haverlo da altro che gli disse haverlo del Papa esso vuole per ogni modo che *mons. di Mantova* sia *il legato del concilio*" (the italics are in cypher). Gonzaga Archives, Mantua. *Cf.* also the report of the Portuguese ambassador of January 26, 1561, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 162 *seq.*

[5] See Massarelli 351. Mula reported on November 14, 1561: *Et ella [Sua S^{tà}] si avviò verso Belvedere, dicendo che, se non m' aggravava il caminare, io la seguisse, e tal volta mi chiamava colla mano dicendo qualche parola e tra le altre che haveva fatto duoi legati per il concilio e domandando, che me ne pareva, laudai grandemente l' uno e l' altro. Ella soggiunse: Ne faremo tre altri, e se non ne havemo de' fatti cardinali che siano al proposito, gli faremo di nuovo, teologi e legisti che siano da bene, e se non bastaranno quelli, ne faremo degli altri e ci andaremo ancora noi, quando conosceremo che sia bisogno. E dicendo io che l' impresa è grande e che bisogna che Sua Santità sia correttore degli errori del tempo passato, ella sospirando pregava Dio che lo potesse fare e che non mancheria di tutto quello che si sapesse immaginare e che tutti dovessero pregare Dio che l' aiutasse in questa difficilissima impresa (Papal Secret Archives).

The Cardinals chosen to represent the Pope were in the highest degree suited for their distinguished position.[2] At their head, as the president of the legatine college, stood Ercole Gonzaga, Cardinal of Mantua, who had been invested with the purple by Clement VII., a man who was distinguished in many ways, and prominent on account of his great personal qualities. Even though his eager striving for the tiara had cast a shadow on his character, yet the son of the celebrated Isabella d'Este, on account of his varied experience extending over many years, his wide knowledge, his zeal for reform, his princely rank and his relationship to the Emperor, can only be described as an able and worthy representative of the Pope.

Ercole Gonzaga was above all things a diplomatist, and was not a learned theologian. What was lacking to him in this respect was possessed in full measure by the other legates; Simonetta, Puteo, Seripando and Hosius. Ludovico Simonetta, who belonged to a humanist family of Milan, held with Gonzaga the chief position, although in point of rank he was the junior of the legates, having only been appointed Cardinal on February 26th, 1561. A clever canonist, he appears as the real confidant of Pius IV., whose rights he always defended with fiery zeal and great skill. It is a significant fact that, with the exception of the president, Simonetta alone had a code at his disposal for his correspondence with Rome.

---

[1] See Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 351. *Cf.* BONDONUS, 546; SERIPANDI Comment., 464; letter of the Portuguese ambassador of March 14, 1561, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 196 *seq.*; *report of Saraceni of March 14 and 18, 1561 (State Archives, Florence).

[2] For what follows *cf.* the excellent account of ŠUSTA, I., xliii *seq.*; lvi *seq.* See also SICKEL, Berichte, V., 65 *seq.*; SOL, Il card. Simonetta, in the Arch. Rom., XXVI., 185 *seq.*; EDER, I., 119 *seq.*; LAUCHERT, 536 *seq.* For Seripando *cf.* Vols. XI., XII. of this work, and for Puteo Vols. XIII., XIV. The monograph of GIOV. DREI, La politica di Pio IV. e del card. E. Gonzaga, 1559-60, in the Arch. d. Soc. Rom., vol., 40, was unfortunately not accessible to me.

Giacomo Puteo, a Cardinal since 1551, had rendered important services to the Church under Julius III. and Paul IV. Like Simonetta, he was possessed of a thorough and comprehensive knowledge of canon law. This made both men peculiarly suited to maintain the rights of the Holy See in the face of the prejudices against the Council.

Hosius and Seripando were distinguished in a similar manner by their theological learning, but their characters were as different as their origin. Girolamo Seripando, who belonged to a noble Apulian family, was undoubtedly the most distinguished man of whom the order of Augustinian Hermits could at that time boast. Paul III. had appointed this native of southern Italy, who was distinguished as preacher, theologian, Ciceronian, Greek scholar, and above all as a friend of Catholic reform, to be their Prior General in 1538. In this capacity Seripando displayed burning zeal, working especially to bring about a thorough reform of his order and to purge it of the Lutheran elements which had penetrated into it. During the first period of the Council of Trent, Seripando had played a most distinguished part. His views had given occasion for the searching deliberations on the subject of justification, in the course of which the well-meant but mistaken theory of compromise which he maintained had been repudiated. From that time Seripando had been mistrusted by the strict conservative party, headed by Carafa. Hostility on the part of the latter, as well as constant illness caused him, in 1551, to resign his position as General of his order, and also prevented any further participation in the deliberations of the Council of Trent, which had again been opened by Julius III., and he devoted himself to his studies at Naples. His appointment as Archbishop of Salerno in the year 1554, enabled him to live in his diocese, and far from Rome, during the pontificate of Paul IV., who was prejudiced against him. The new Pope called to mind the refined and sober minded scholar, summoned him to Rome, and on February 26th, 1561, admitted him into the Sacred College.

Stanislaus Hosius, Bishop of Ermland, a scholar like Seripando, was of quite a different nature. He had already rendered distinguished service to the Catholic restoration as the leader of the bishops of his native land, Poland, against the encroachments of Protestantism at various diets, as well as by his effective book " Confession of the Catholic Faith," when Pius IV. appointed him as nuncio to Ferdinand I. His energetic, if at times harsh nature, as well as his somewhat clumsy person, rendered him, however, little suited for diplomatic negotiations. Pius IV. nevertheless honoured his services and his learning when, at the great creation of February, 1561, he summoned him to the supreme senate of the Church.

The bull of appointment for the five legates of the Council is dated March 10th, 1561.[1] The special position which Ercole Gonzaga was to occupy as president of the legatine college, is not mentioned in this ; it was, however, sufficiently expressed by the consistent preference shown him by the Holy See.[2]

In the appointment of the officials of the Council, which took place as early as January, Pius IV., to a great extent, reappointed those persons who had worked so successfully in a similar capacity under Paul III. and Julius III. Gian Tommaso Sanfelice, Bishop of La Cava, was appointed commissary ; he left Rome on January 26th, 1561, and reached

---

[1] In RAYNALDUS, 1561, n. 2 ; LE PLAT, IV., 697 *seq.* ; EHSES, VIII., 176. *Cf.* Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 353 ; THEINER, I., 666 ; SICKEL, Konzil, 184.

[2] See ŠUSTA, I., 4. Here also concerning Gonzaga's private secretariate, which developed into the real presidential office for the whole legation. Puteo was originally intended for first president ; it was only after his serious illness that Gonzaga took the first place. In the acts the presidents are always named exactly in the order of their bulls of appointment, Gonzaga first, Seripando second, Hosius third, and Simonetta fourth.

Trent on February 24th.[1] The important position of secretary of the Council was entrusted once more to Angelo Massarelli, Bishop of Telese; his appointment followed on February 2nd, and he left Rome on March 11th, reaching Trent on the 26th.[2]

The legates then in Rome, Seripando and Simonetta, received the legatine cross in a secret consistory of March 17th.[3] In the same consistory the Pope exhorted all the bishops to repair to Trent.[4] The bull of appointment was sent to Cardinal Ercole Gonzaga on March 22nd, with instructions to proceed immediately to Trent.[5] On March 15th, Cardinal Borromeo informed Hosius by letter of his appointment as legate, instructing him to do everything in his power to induce the Emperor to send representatives to the Council, and then to go himself without delay to Trent.[6]

---

[1] See Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 350; BONDONUS, 546; THEINER I., 666 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 15, 11, 2; SICKEL, Berichte, I., 21. *Cf.* the *Avviso di Roma of January 25, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 244, Vatican Library). On March 5, 1561, Antonio Manelli was appointed "depositario del s. concilio Tridentino;" his *Libro delle spese del s. concilio di Trento is in the Vallicella Library, L 40; see CALENZIO, Docum. sul concilio di Trento, xii *seq.*, Rome 1874, and ŠUSTA, I., 53 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 27 *seq.*, concerning the secret fund coexisting with the other, and administered by the president, Ercole Gonzaga. *Cf.* also Cerasoli in the Arch. stor. Ital. 5th series, VIII., 289 *seq.*

[2] See MASSARELLI, 351, 353; BONDONUS, 547; SICKEL, Berichte, I., 21; ŠUSTA, I., 6.

[3] Puteo was then seriously ill. *Cf.* BONDONUS, 547; THEINER, I., 667. According to a *report of Fr. Tonina of March 22, 1561, Seripando received 1,000 scudi for his journey to Trent (Gonzaga Arch. Mantua).

[4] *Report of Tonina of March 19, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). PALLAVICINI, 15, 11, 2.

[5] The Cardinal was allowed, in accordance with his request, to spend the Easter festival at Maguzzano. Brief of Pius IV., of March 22, 1561, in ŠUSTA, I., 1 *seq.*

[6] STEINHERZ, I., 226 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 233, the repetition of the order to start as soon as the Emperor should have signified his willingness to send envoys to the Council, dated March 23, 1561.

On March 21st Pius IV. granted an indulgence to all those who, after receiving the sacraments, were present at the entry of the legates, and prayed for the successful issue of the Council.[1] Seripando started for Trent on March 26th, and had a long conference with the Pope before he set out.[2]

Ferdinand I., in his conferences with Hosius on March 18th and 19th, had replied to the earnest request for his decision by reproaching the Pope with having occasioned the delay, since he had not yet answered the Emperor's question as to what he intended to do with regard to the reply of the Protestant princes assembled at Naumburg. Ferdinand, however, had already been informed of the Pope's intentions in a letter from Arco, which arrived on March 18th. Pius IV. had answered the ambassador, when he had handed him the documents from Naumburg, that, as the Council was summoned for Easter, he must send his legates to Trent, but that these would, in the meantime, hold no sessions with the bishops who were there; the Pope would await the decision of the Catholic princes of Germany. In spite of this, Ferdinand, when he was again urged by Hosius to appoint his representatives, kept repeating that he was waiting for the decision of the Pope, which was evidently a mere excuse to conceal his own indecision.[3]

In the meantime, great difficulties in the way of the acceptance of the conciliar bull had also arisen in Spain. The theologians there objected to the evasion of the question as to whether the Council was a new one or a continuation of the former one, and insisted that the latter view must be definitely expressed.[4] The Spanish bishops attached great importance to this question, because they wished to be sure that the decree of the Council concerning the subordination of the cathedral chapters would be upheld.[5] The representations of the theologians were listened to the more favourably by Philip II. as relations between the Pope and the king had been somewhat strained since the end of 1560, and the favourable opportunity of bringing pressure to bear on Pius IV. could not be foregone by the Spanish privy council.[1]

---

[1] See Raynaldus, 1561, n. 4; Le Plat, IV., 698 *seq.*

[2] See Massarelli, 353; Seripandi Comment., 464.

[3] *Cf.* Steinherz, I., ci *seq.*, 228 *seq.*, 235 *seq.*

[4] *Cf.* Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 348, and Colección de docum. inéd., IX., 97.

[5] See Sickel, Konzil, 185, 189, 209 *seq.*

After Philip had refrained from giving a decisive answer in the month of February, he at last declared to the nuncio on March 12th, that he had decided not to accept the bull immediately nor to send his prelates, but to wait and see how things turned out in Germany and France, and that in the meantime he would lay his wishes for the alteration of the bull before the Pope.[2] For this purpose Don Juan de Ayala was sent to Rome in March. He was ordered to ask from the Pope an express declaration that no new Council, but a continuation of the Council of Trent was convoked by the bull of November 29th, 1560, as the king had taken this for granted all through his negotiations.[3] De Ayala arrived in Rome on April 16th, 1561, and had an interview with the Pope on the following day.[4]

As the appearance of the Spanish bishops was impossible before an understanding had been arrived at with Philip II., and a delay in the opening of the Council had thus become imperative, Hosius received fresh instructions on April 16th, no longer to urge the Emperor to the immediate dispatch of his representatives to Trent, but only to hold them in readiness to go as soon as the Spanish bishops should have started for Trent.[5] Canobio, who was again sent to Vienna with similar instructions on April 16th, was entrusted with further negotiations.[1] Hosius was immediately to inform the Emperor that the Pope, in order to comply with the latter's wishes, was prepared to proceed to the Council, together with the whole College of Cardinals, as soon as he considered it fitting and necessary. As this, however, was not possible at the present moment, he proposed that after the opening of the Council he himself should take up his residence at Bologna, and the Emperor at Innsbruck, so as to be nearer to the seat of the Council, and to support it. Canobio handed this proposal to the Emperor in writing. In his answer on May 6th, Ferdinand referred to his efforts with the Protestants, and declared that he had neglected nothing in the matter which was incumbent on him as Emperor; that he had already appointed envoys for the Council, whom he would send to Trent as soon as possible. In the event of the Pope going to Trent, he promised that he would not only proceed to Innsbruck, but that he would even go himself to the seat of the Council. By this Ferdinand had declared his acceptance of the conciliar bull. The untiring eloquence of Hosius had been to a great extent decisive in overcoming the objections of the Emperor, and in gaining his agreement to the appointment of the envoys.[2] Encouraged by the success he had already met with, the nuncio made an important request on May 8th and 18th, namely that Ferdinand should send a representative to Trent immediately. The Emperor, however, would not agree to this, although he promised that his representatives should be the first to appear at Trent, but that he would not send his envoys until the other powers had given orders to their representatives to start.[3] The Emperor was strengthened in this resolve by a report from Arco, which arrived on May 25th, and conveyed to him the Pope's wish that he should act in this way, without paying attention to the pressure of Hosius.[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* REIMANN, Unterhandlungen, 619 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, I., 15 *seq.*, 172.

[2] DÖLLINGER, I.. 355 *seq.*

[3] See the Instrucion secreta a D. J. de Ayala of March 13, 1561, in DÖLLINGER, I., 358 *seq.*; *cf.* Coleccion de docum. inéd., IX., 94.

[4] See *Avviso di Roma of April 18, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 268, Vatican Library). *Cf.* Cal. of State Papers, Foreign, 1561-1562, 64; ŠUSTA, I., 16.

[5] Borromeo to Hosius, in STEINHERZ, I., 243 *seq.* *Cf.* the letter of Borromeo to E. Gonzaga in ŠUSTA, I., 14.

---

[1] See Steinherz, I., ciii. *seq.*, 251 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* Sickel, Konzil, 191 *seq.*, 194 *seq.*; Steinherz, I., civ., 252; Ehses, VIII., 200, 204 *seq.*

[3] See Steinherz, I., civ., 249, 254 *seq.*

[4] See Steinherz, I., civ. *seq.* For the Pope's reasons *cf.* the report of the Portuguese ambassador of May 2, 1561, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 236.

Canobio also informed the Emperor that the Pope had resolved to convey to the Russian Tsar, Ivan Wassiljewicz, as well as to the King of Poland, a conciliar bull and a brief (of April 13th, 1561) just as his predecessors had invited the Greek Emperor to general councils. Ferdinand agreed to this mission, and Hosius decided that Canobio should undertake its discharge. When Canobio reached the court of the Polish King, Sigismund Augustus, the latter declared himself quite ready to support the Council, but he refused to allow the journey to Russia through his kingdom.[1] Pius IV., however, would not give up his purpose of negotiating with the Russian Tsar, and without the knowledge of the Polish King or the Emperor, he appointed a new envoy to Russia in the person of Giovanni Geraldi, whose journey, however, ended in a Polish prison; he only succeeded in regaining his liberty in 1564.[2]

One of the few countries from which gratifying news arrived was Portugal, the king of which country, Sebastian, was full of zeal for the Council. On March 17th, 1561, the nuncio, Prospero Santa Croce, reported to Borromeo from Lisbon: "It is the firm resolve of the king that all the prelates of his kingdom shall attend the Council, and in view of the importance of the matter, no excuses will be accepted. The king will send his envoy to Trent as soon as he has heard of the appointment of the legates." The Pope praised the zeal of the king in a brief of April 26th, 1561.[3]

---

[1] *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 192, 195; STEINHERZ, I., 243, 245; ŠUSTA, I., 11; PALLAVICINI, 15, 9, 4; PIERLING, I., 369 *seq.*; ÜBERSBERGER, I., 348. The brief to the Tsar in RAYNALDUS, 1561, n. 17; LE PLAT, IV., 700 *seq.* For the great difficulties which, in spite of the acceptance of the conciliar bull on the part of the King, arose in Poland on the question of the appointment of delegates for the Council, see ŠUSTA, I., 121.

[2] *Cf.* PIERLING, Rome et Moscou, 53 *seq.*, Paris, 1883; PIERLING, 373 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, I., 285 *seq.*; TURGENIEV, Russiae Monum., I., 181 *seq.*; ÜBERSBERGER, I., 349.

[3] *Cf.* LAEMMER, Melet., 184; STEINHERZ, I., 247; RAYNALDUS, 1561, n. 14; LE PLAT, IV., 702; Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 235; ŠUSTA, I., 24; EHSES, VIII., 175, 198.

On April 6th, the Easter Sunday of 1561, on which day the Council should have been opened, there were only four bishops, but none of the legates, present in Trent.[1] On April 16th Cardinals Gonzaga and Seripando made their solemn entry into the city of the Council, being welcomed only by the Bishop of Trent, Cardinal Madruzzo, and nine other bishops.[2] The indulgence of March 21st had been previously promulgated on April 12th. There could be no question of opening the Council at once, for the number of prelates at Trent increased but slowly during the following months.[3] On April 21st the legates wrote to Borromeo that the Pope again should exhort the prelates in Rome to start soon, so that those in other countries might the more quickly make up their minds.[4] The arrival, on May 18th, of the distinguished Archbishop of Braga, Bartolomeo de Martyribus, as the "first born of the ultramontane nations" was joyfully acclaimed; he informed the legates that three or four more bishops from Portugal, and the envoy of the king, would soon follow.[5] The Pope was particularly touched and gladdened at this news.[6]

The negotiations with the powers were still going on. As the discussions with Don Juan de Ayala in Rome had led to no result, the Bishop of Terracina, Ottaviano Raverta, who had previously been nuncio in Spain, and was much beloved there, was sent to Philip II. on May 23rd. He took with him important concessions on the points at issue with the Spanish government. He was authorized, with regard to the Council, to offer the king that he should be sent a secret brief, designating the bull of November the 18th as a "bull of continuation."[1] When Raverta reached the Spanish court on June 13th, Philip had already given way in view of the grave development in affairs in France, and in order to gain the assistance of Pius IV. against the Turks.[2] The nuncio, Giovanni Campegio, Bishop of Bologna, had learned this at the beginning of June, and had at once informed Rome of it.[3] The official announcement took the form of a royal circular on June 13th, which summoned all the bishops to prepare for their journey at the beginning of September; the number of those who were to go to the Council, and the definite time of their departure, was to be decided later.[4] The brief which Philip II. desired, containing the declaration concerning the continuation of the Council of Trent, was drawn up on July 17th, and was immediately dispatched, together with an autograph letter of the Pope of July 16th, declaring the validity of the decrees of the Council of Trent.[5]

---

[1] See THEINER, I., 667, 668. The first bishop who arrived at Trent was Nic. Sfondrato of Cremona, afterwards Pope Gregory XIV.

[2] *Cf.* MASSARELLI, 354; BONDONUS, 547 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, I., 7; GIULIANI, Trento al tempo del Concilio (extract from the Arch. Trid., 1888), 88 *seq.* Gonzaga resided, as did Morone later on, in the palace of Sigismund Thun (now the Municipio) in the Via Larga; see SWOBODA, 23. Here there are also some reproductions of the many pictures which represent the sessions of the Council. See also GALANTE, Kultur-histor., Bilder vom Trienter Konzil, Innsbruck, 1912.

[3] See THEINER, I., 667-8.

[4] ŠUSTA, I., 12.

[5] MASSARELLI, 356; ŠUSTA, I., 24. The date "April 18" in THEINER, I., 668, is wrong.

[6] *Cf.* the report of the Portuguese ambassador of June 18, 1561, in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 273.

By this act of compliance on the part of Philip II. the most dangerous rock was avoided, and the meeting of the Council was assured.[6] On July 2nd, the official announcement of this favourable turn of affairs, which had so far only been known privately, arrived in Rome.[7] Three days later the

---

[1] See Šusta, I., 31 *seq.*, 204.

[2] *Cf.* Šusta, I., 194, and Steinherz, I., 274.

[3] See his report of June 5, 1561, in Šusta, I., 193.

[4] See Gachard, Corresp. de Marguerite, I., 291; Šusta, I., 194. Eder (I., 78) is wrong in giving the date of the circular as June 3.

[5] One of the documents in Sickel, Berichte, II., 107, the other in Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 366. *Cf.* Ehses, VIII., 279.

[6] The opinion of Steinherz, I., cix.

[7] See Borromeo's letter to Hosius of July 2, 1561, in Steinherz, I., 273 *seq.*, and that of the same date to the legates of the Council in Šusta, I., 44 *seq.*

Pope communicated the news to the Emperor and exhorted him no longer to delay in appointing his prelates and envoys. A letter to the same effect was immediately sent to King Charles IX. of France, while the other Catholic powers, such as the Signoria of Venice, also received news of the same important event.[1]

When Hosius delivered the Papal letter to the Emperor on July 18th, the latter repeated the answer that he had already given to Canobio, namely that he had already resolved to send his envoys to Trent, but that he could not as yet name any fixed date for their departure. Even the successor of Hosius, the persuasive Delfino, after repeated exhortations, could only get the same answer, that the envoys of the Emperor would reach Trent before those of the Spanish king.[2]

Hosius, who had long wished to go to Trent, left Vienna on July 29th; he reached the seat of the Council on August 20th, refusing, in his retiring way, any solemn reception.[3]

At midsummer Pius IV. was still working zealously on behalf of the Council. The legates, Puteo and Simonetta, received instructions in July to hold themselves in readiness for the journey.[4] The nuncios were commissioned to see to the sending of the delegates to the Council, while the Pope himself attended to this in Italy. On August 1st briefs to this effect were addressed to all the bishops of the peninsula, on the 3rd to those of Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica and Dalmatia, and on the 9th to the Archbishops of Cyprus and Crete. The prelates who were in Rome were repeatedly admonished to start for Trent, but some delay was allowed to them as it was evident that the Spanish bishops could not reach Trent before October.[5] When threatening news arrived from France, Pius IV. declared to the Imperial ambassador on August 23rd, that he would irrevocably open the Council, even should Ferdinand I. be unable to take part in it. On the following day the Pope decided in consistory that all the Italian bishops were to repair to Trent within eight days. Many of those who were resident in Rome resisted even now, so that the number of prelates at the seat of the Council increased but slowly.[1]

---

[1] See SICKEL, Konzil, 205; ŠUSTA, I., 48 *seq.*, 219.

[2] See STEINHERZ, I., cv. *seq.*

[3] See STEINHERZ, I., 290; MASSARELLI 357.

[4] *Avviso di Roma of July 12, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 287, Vatican Library).

[5] See the letters from Borromeo of July 26, and August 2 and 20, 1561, in ŠUSTA, I., 64 *seq.*, 69, 71 *seq.*, 73 *seq.* *Cf.* *Avviso di Roma of August 9, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 224, Vatican Library),

Nevertheless, at first it was only Italians who were present at Trent; the arrival of the bishops from other countries, with the exception of the Portuguese who were already there, was still delayed. On September 26th the Bishop of Vich arrived, as the first of the Spaniards,[2] but for the most part, it was November before the others one by one reached Trent.[3] Philip II., after repeated exhortations from the nuncio,

---

and the Portuguese reports in the Corpo dipl. Portug., IX., 287, 318. The Portuguese ambassador undertook to see that the letter of Pius IV. of August 20, 1561, to the Negus Minas of Abyssinia, in which he was invited to send envoys to Trent, reached him (printed in BECCARI, Rerum Aethiop. Script. occid., X., 125); the letter never reached the Negus (see *ibid.*, 125 n.).

[1] See MASSARELLI, 356 *seq.*; THEINER, I., 670 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, I., 75 *seq.*, 77 *seq.*, 90. An *Avviso di Roma of September 6, 1561, states that the Pope had ordered 25 bishops to go to the Council, and that they were starting (Urb. 1039, p. 298, Vatican Library). *Cf.* also the *letter of G. A. Caligari to Commendone, dated Rome, September 13, 1561 (Lett. di princ., XXIII., 34, Papal Secret Archives). On October 13, 1561, Serristori *writes that the Pope insisted that all the bishops should go to the Council (State Archives, Florence). But again on November 8, it is reported that the Pope had urged the bishops to go there, that 7 had started yesterday, but that many refused (*Avviso di Roma of November 8, 1561, Urb. 1039, p. 308, Vatican Library); the Pope, nevertheless, remained firm on the point that with a few exceptions all must start out on their journey (*Avvisi of December 20, 1561, and January 3, 1562, *loc. cit.*, pp. 319b, 329).

[2] *Cf.* MASSARELLI, 358; THEINER, I., 670; ŠUSTA, I., 78, 80.

[3] MASSARELLI, 258 *seqq.* *Cf.* ŠUSTA, I., 90.

had decided to send several bishops at once; the choice of the others who were to go to the Council was only made in September.[1] The appointment and sending of an envoy was deferred until later.

The nuncio, Gualterio, had in September little to report from France that was gratifying, as far as the prospects of the departure of the envoys for the Council was concerned. The attitude of the French government towards this important question was now, as before, very ambiguous.[2] On October 8th, indeed, Borromeo was able to write to the nuncio that he had heard that the Queen Regent proposed to send her orators and prelates; that, however, had been a vain hope, and had not been fulfilled, for the French council did not believe in the usefulness of an ecumenical synod, but hoped to be in a position to enter into a compromise with the Huguenots, by means of a religious conference and certain concessions on the part of the Pope.[3] The decision arrived at by twenty-five of the bishops at the end of October, by which six of them were to proceed at once to San Martino, was not taken seriously.[4] It was also most unfortunate that the Emperor proved himself so little desirous of keeping his promise, and of sending his envoys and the bishops of his hereditary dominions to the Council. He was indeed resolved to do so, as he had said, but he wished to wait as long as possible before sending the envoys, as he feared lest his representatives might arrive too soon at Trent, and have to remain there alone.[5] He hesitated to give a definite answer till winter had actually arrived, and it was only when he had learned from his ambassador, Arco, that the Pope had given orders for the opening of the Council,[1] that he promised Delfino, in a binding form, on December 1st, that his envoys would certainly be in Trent by the middle of January. Delfino reported this on December 1st to the legates at Trent, and to Borromeo in Rome.[2] There were also difficulties with regard to the persons who were to be sent, but these were all settled by the end of December as follows: Ferdinand was to be represented as Emperor by two envoys—by an ecclesiastic, the former Bishop of Vienna, and Archbishop designate of Prague, Anton Brus von Müglitz; and by a layman, Count Sigismund von Thun; as King of Hungary he was to be represented by the Bishop of Fünfkirchen, Georg Draskovich.[3] In this way the remainder of the year 1561 passed away, without the Council having been opened.

---

[1] See Šusta, I., 78, 80, 257.

[2] See Šusta, I., 248 *seq.*; *cf.* 181 *seq.*, 215 *seq.* On September 13, 1561, G. A. Caligari *wrote from Rome to Commendone: "Si dice che le cose di Francia vanno molto male e seguitano il loro conciliabolo." Lett. di princ., XXIII., 34 (Papal Secret Archives).

[3] *Cf.* Šusta, I., 87 *seq.*, 290.

[4] *Cf.* Šusta, I., 290.

[5] See Steinherz, I., cvi.

In a consistory of November 10th, Mark Sittich von Hohenems was appointed legate to the Council in the place of the invalid Puteo, who was unable to travel, and it was further resolved that the departure of the fourth legate, Simonetta, for Trent, which had been expected for months, but always postponed, should now take place at once. The choice of Mark Sittich, which had been made principally on account of his relationship to the Pope, was not a fortunate one; he may also have been chosen because, by his birth, and by reason of his bishopric of Constance, he belonged to the German nation.[4] On November 15th, the indulgence bull for the happy issue of the Council was published; it announced that the Pope intended to hold a solemn procession from St. Peter's to S. Maria del Popolo on November 23rd.[1]

---

[1] See Arco's report of November 22, 1561, in SICKEL, Konzil, 235.

[2] See the report of Delfino in STEINHERZ, I., 325 *seq.* *Cf.* ŠUSTA, I., 124.

[3] See STEINHERZ, I., cvi, 339; KASSOWITZ, 37 *seq.*

[4] Concerning the choice of Mark Sittich, well known for his want of education, and the ill feeling aroused thereby in Catholic circles, *cf.* ŠUSTA, I., 101. Of Puteo an *Avviso di Roma already reports on August 30, 1561, that the Cardinal will not go to Trent, being old and very much needed in Rome (Urb. 1039, p. 296, Vatican Library).

Cardinal Simonetta, who had been detained in Rome by the important affairs of the Dataria, left on November 20th and arrived in Trent on December 9th.[2] In the credentials for the other legates, which were entrusted to him, the Pope declares his wish, now that he had waited long enough for all the princes, that the Council should no longer be delayed, but opened at once, and proceeded with as quickly as possible. In a postscript in his own hand, the Pope says: "We are not in the habit of using many words, but rather prefer deeds. Hitherto we have waited sufficiently long for all the princes and the matter can therefore no longer be delayed, but the Council must be opened as soon as possible, and continued with all speed; the former Council of Trent will once more be resumed, nor may it be repudiated in any of its parts. We wish, as a man of honour, as a good Christian, and as a good Pope, that a good Council shall be held, and that its one aim be directed to the service of God, of the faith, and of religion, to the universal well-being of the whole of Christendom, as well as to the honour of the Holy See. We have made it our object to finish this Council, to confirm it and carry it into effect, and by it We desire the union of all good Catholics, and enduring peace through the whole of Christendom, so that We may serve God in concord, and be able to use all our strength against the infidel and the enemies of the Christian name. When this object is attained, We shall willingly and gladly die."[1] A second autograph letter from the Pope, accrediting Cardinal Simonetta, was addressed to the Cardinal of Mantua alone, in order to emphasize the peculiar position of that prelate as head of the legates, and the first in point of rank.[2]

---

[1] The bull (in RAYNALDUS, 1561, n. 10; LE PLAT, IV., 735; and EHSES, VIII., 256 *seq.*) was published in Trent on November 29 (see MASSARELLI, 361). Concerning the procession in Rome and the arrival of Mark Sittich there on November 28, *cf.* the *Avviso di Roma of November 29, 1561 (Urb. 1039, p. 314b, Vatican Library). See also the Portuguese report of November 27, 1561, in the Corpo. dipl. Portug., IX., 406.

[2] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, I., 114 *seq.*; SICKEL, Konzil, 235; THEINER, I., 672. Simonetta took up his residence in the Palazzo Geremia, in the Via Larga, facing the Palazzo Thun; see SWOBODA, 41.

In the instructions given to Simonetta, the intentions of the Pope, as to which the legate was to inform his colleagues, were set forth in greater detail. They were to the following effect : immediately after his arrival, the Council was to be opened, and the work taken in hand by the prelates who were present. The Council was to be principally engaged in finishing the little that still remained to be dealt with as regards dogma, especially the doctrine of the Sacraments ; this was the most important thing. The reform of abuses was already settled, or at least so far advanced that it could easily be brought to a close. In this connection it was taken for granted that only such reforms were to be dealt with at Trent as did not affect the Roman court, for the Pope looked upon these as his own prerogative.[3] As far as the question of continuation was concerned, Simonetta was authorized by his instructions, in the event of any dispute arising, to declare openly that the Council was a continuation of the previous one; the decrees of Trent, published under Paul III. and Julius III., were to be regarded as valid, and under no circumstances to be called in question. The legates were to prevent the question of the Pope's supremacy over the Council from being made the subject of discussion, especially as the former Council had accepted the Papal supremacy without question. Should matters, however, go so far, that the prelates were not to be turned from the treatment of this article, then the legates were to suspend the Council, and inform the Pope by courier; he would then take further measures, and either remove the Council to another place or dissolve it altogether.[1]

---

[1] The credentials, dated November 19, 1561, in part in PALLAVICINI, 15, 13, 2, and complete in ŠUSTA, I., 113 *seq.* ; in *San Carlo*, 89, they are given in phototype from the original.

[2] The letter, dated November 20, 1561, in ŠUSTA, I., 115.

[3] *Cf.* EDER, I., 121 *seq.*, who rightly remarks that the work of reform which had at that time been energetically undertaken in Rome aimed at withdrawing from the Council the "Reformatio Capite." For this reform work *cf.* SICKEL, 242 ; ŠUSTA, I., 119 ; *Avvisi di Roma of December 6, 13, and 20, 1561, and January 10, 1562 (Urb. 1039, pp. 317b *seq.*, 319b, 325b, 310, Vatican Library). On December 20, 1561, Tonina gives the following account of this work : *Sopra la bolla del conclave, del qual S. S^{tà} ad ogni hora ragiona, non vi è cardinale che concorri nella opinione sua, di farlo in Castello, patendo questa sua opinione molte contrarietà che si adducono de incomodi, pericoli, et che anco il luoco non sia capace, però si crede che non se ne farà altro. Circa la bolla della riforma a questa si attende et si crede pure che in ciò si farà qualche profitto, ancora che portarà tempo, perchè dovendosi reformare ogniuno in casa sua ci bisognano molte considerationi, molto tempo et molto che fare, in riandare

Two further documents for the legates were probably taken to Trent by Simonetta: a brief of September 22nd, 1561, which authorized the legates, in case of need, to remove the Council at their own discretion to another city, and another brief of the same date which decided that if the Pope should die during the Council, the choice of his successor was not to belong to the Council, but to the Cardinals.[2]

Shortly before the arrival of Simonetta, during the night between December 8th and 9th, the report of Delfino had reached Trent, that in accordance with his promise, the Emperor's envoys would arrive by the middle of January. The legates at once informed all the prelates present, and resolved, in consideration of this news, to postpone the opening of the Council until January 15th; Delfino was informed of

---

una strada tanto invecchiata et bisognando quasi passare da un estremo all' altro. (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[1] The instruction, according to the minute of the private secretary, T. Galli, in Šusta, I., 116 *seq.*

[2] Both documents in Raynaldus, 1561, n. 7-9; Le Plat, IV., 721 *seq.*, and Ehses, VIII., 179 *seq.*, 248. *Cf.* Šusta, I., 118 *seq.* See also the Acta consist. of November 19, 1561, in Laemmer, Melet., 213, and Ehses, VIII., 121. *Cf.* Sägmüller, Papstwahlbullen, 118.

this on December 9th. In a letter to Borromeo, dated December 11th, the legates gave their reasons for thus deviating from the expressed will of the Pope, and begged for his approval. This was granted them through Borromeo on December 20th, and it was added that should the arrival of the Imperial envoys, or the representatives of any other great power, still be imminent, then a further short postponement would be allowed.[1]

Immediately after the arrival of Simonetta, the legates consulted together as to what matter they should deal with first; they decided that it would be best to commence with the Index of forbidden books, so as to avoid bringing up the question of the continuation at the very outset, by going on with the doctrine of the Sacraments. Simonetta communicated this intention to Rome on December 11th, and the Pope consented.[2] Before the answer arrived, however, the legates returned to the question on December 18th, paying special attention to the objections and difficulties, and changed their proposal in such a way that they now decided that it would be advisable to put the question to the assembled prelates in the first congregation after the opening, as to whether they thought it best to continue to deal with the articles not yet decided, or to deliberate upon new ones; they were of opinion that everyone would accept the continuation, and that in this way nobody would be able to say anything against the Pope, as the Council itself would have declared its opinion. To this they received an answer from the Pope, through Borromeo, on December 27th, that His Holiness left it entirely to their discretion to act as they thought best.[3] On January 3rd the legates, who had been busily employed during these days with the preliminary work of the Council, sent to Rome a draft of a decree for the first session, which had been drawn up by Seripando.[1]

---

[1] Šusta, I., 122 *seq.*, 139. Borromeo had previously (to Ercole Gonzaga, December 15, 1561) recommended the Epiphany as a suitable day for the opening of the Council. Pius IV. also decided in favour of that day in the consistory of December 17; see Šusta, I., 132 *seq.*, 134.

[2] Borromeo to the legates on December 20, 1561, in Šusta, I., 139.

[3] Šusta, I., 129 *seq.*, 143.

In a consistory on December 17th, the Pope, who, in spite of the difficulties which still existed, was firmly resolved[2] on a speedy opening of the Council, bestowed the legatine cross on Mark Sittich. The departure of the Cardinal, however, was delayed until the new year, and he did not reach Trent until January 30th, 1562.[3]

The Pope, as he informed the legates through Cardinal Borromeo on December 31st, 1561, had chosen January 18th, 1562, a Sunday, on which day the feast of St. Peter's Chair fell, for the opening day of the Council.[4] On the receipt of Delfino's information that the Imperial envoys would hardly be in Trent before the end of January, it was left to the legates, on January 7th, to postpone the opening for another eight or ten days.[5]

As there were already about a hundred prelates assembled at Trent, the legates resolved to keep to January 18th. On the 15th the first preparatory General Congregation assembled. It was held at the residence of Cardinal Gonzaga, who, as first legate, opened it with an address and prayer. Then the secretary of the Council, Massarelli, read aloud the decrees arranged for the inaugural session, and a Papal brief, by which, in order to avoid disputes concerning precedure, the order of rank among the Fathers of the Council was decided. According to this the patriarchs were to come first, the archbishops second, and the bishops third; the primates, on the other hand, were to have no precedence over the other archbishops; within the various ranks, the fathers were to be arranged according to the date of their appointment.[1]

---

[1] Šusta, I., 144 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 146 *seq.* the draft of the decree.

[2] *Cf.* in Appendix No. 19 the *report of Fr. Tonina of December 3, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] *Report of Tonina, dated Rome, December 17, 1561 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). *Cf.* Šusta, I., 134, 151, II., 14 *seq.*; Steinherz, III., 1; Theiner, I., 680; Ehses, VIII., 122.

[4] Šusta, I., 151.

[5] *Ibid.*, 156.

Before the meeting of the General Congregation, the legates had been successful in settling a difficulty which might have proved very dangerous for the Council which was on the point of being opened. On January 5th, the Archbishop of Granada, Pedro Guerrero, had gone to Seripando to demand, in the name of the Spanish bishops, that every ambiguity should be avoided at the opening, and that the Council should be clearly and definitely designated as a continuation of the former one. On January 11th Guerrero repeated his demand in the presence of the four legates and Cardinal Madruzzo, and threatened to make a protest. The legates did everything they could to avoid this, and at the last moment their efforts were crowned with success. The archbishop withdrew his request, after having been assured by the legates that no expression would be used at the opening of the Council which could be taken as a declaration against continuation; the Council would be opened exactly in accordance with the text of the bull of convocation, the declaration of continuation would follow at the fitting time, and at the close, the earlier decrees, drawn up under Paul III. and Julius III. together with the new decisions, would receive the confirmation of the Pope.[2]

---

[1] See THEINER, I., 673 *seq.*; PALEOTTO, *ibid.*, II., 530 *seq.*; RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 3 *seq.* *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 15, 15, 6 *seq.*; Musotti in DÖLLINGER, Konzil, II., 5. The brief concerning precedence, dated December 31, 1561, in RAYNALDUS, 1561, n. 12; LE PLAT, IV., 755; EHSES, VIII., 271. The bull *Ad universalis* bears the same date of December 31, 1561, which decides that the right of voting can only be exercised by those who are present in person, and not by proxies. EHSES, VIII., 269 *seq.*

[2] Besides the letters from the legates to Borromeo of January 12 and 15, 1562, in ŠUSTA, I., 152 *seq.*, 158 *seq.*, *cf.* Musotti in DÖLLINGER, Konzil, II., 4 *seq.*; SERIPANDI Comment., 470 *seq.*; Paleotto in THEINER, II., 530, and the report of Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoça, Bishop of Salamanca, who acted as mediator, in DÖLLINGER, *loc. cit.*, 64 *seq.* *Cf.* the letters of the Bishops of Sutri-Nepi and Modena to Morone of January 15, 1562, in EHSES, VIII., 279 *seq.*

CHAPTER VIII.

REOPENING OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. SESSIONS XVII TO XXII.

Two complete years, full of work and anxieties, had been necessary, in order to overcome the "sea of difficulties" which the reopening of the Council had had to face. The satisfaction of Pius IV. was therefore great and fully justified when, at the end of the third year of his pontificate, he at last saw all his efforts crowned with success.[1]

It was a momentous day for the Church and the Papacy when all the members of the Council present in Trent assembled in the ancient church of S. Peter, on the morning of January 18th, 1562, in order to proceed in procession to the neighbouring Cathedral for the purpose of the solemn opening of the General Council of the Church. The members of the secular and regular clergy of the city formed the head of the procession, and these were followed by the mitred abbots, ninety bishops, eleven archbishops, and three patriarchs. Then followed the Duke of Mantua, the nephew of the Cardinal, who had come to Trent for the solemnity, Cardinal Madruzzo, and the four Papal legates, Gonzaga, Simonetta, Seripando and Hosius, whose dignity was denoted by an infula of gold material. The secular ambassadors should have followed the legates, but none had as yet arrived. Four generals of orders followed, with the Auditor of the Roman Rota, the Consistorial Advocate, the Promoter of the Council, and lastly the magistrates of Trent and other lay persons of distinction.

---

[1] The Pope expressed his joy at the opening of the Council in a consistory on January 28, 1562. See Acta consist. in LAEMMER, Melet., 213 *seq.*, and EHSES, VIII., 271. *Cf.* also Borromeo's letter to Simonetta in ŠUSTA II., 18.

Cardinal Gonzaga celebrated High Mass, and the sermon was delivered by the Archbishop of Reggio, Gaspare del Fosso. After the usual ceremonies, the Secretary of the Council read the Bull of Indiction, and the Archbishop of Reggio the two decrees which had been accepted in the General Congregation of January 15th,[1] which were now approved. Four Spaniards however, led by the Archbishop of Granada, Pedro Guerrero, protested against the decision that the Council was to act under the presidency, and to follow the proposals, of the legates.[2] During the session, the Bishop of Fünfkirchen, Georg Draskovich, one of the orators of the princes, arrived; he was to represent Ferdinand I. as King of Hungary.[3]

For the moment, the question of the continuation was only evaded. The legates resolved, in view of the widely divergent views and demands of the powers, and in order not to impede the course of the Council, to deal at first with matters of secondary importance. In the General Congregation of January 27th, they submitted three articles for discussion at the next Session; these concerned prohibited books, and the drawing up of a letter of safe-conduct for the Protestants.[4] It was further decided to add four more prelates, who were to examine the mandates of the procurators of the bishops who were prevented from coming. The articles submitted were dealt with in ten General Congregations.[5] On January 30th, Mark Sittich, the long expected fifth legate, arrived; he brought the decision of Pius IV. on the much debated question as to whether the city of the Council should have a protective force of Papal troops. The Pope decided that the defence of the Council should be entrusted to Cardinal Madruzzo, as the temporal lord of the district, and that a monthly allowance of 200 scudi should be assigned to him from the treasury of the Council.[1]

---

[1] See *supra* p. 262.

[2] *Cf.* THEINER, I., 676; PALEOTTO *ibid.*, II., 533, ; RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 5-8; BONDONUS 554 *seq.;* Musotti in DÖLLINGER, Konzil, II., 5; report of the legates to Borromeo on January 19, 1562, in ŠUSTA, I., 163-6. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI 15, 16.

[3] *Cf.* FRAKNÓI, A magyar fögapok a trienti zinaton, Estergom, 1863; KASSOWITZ, 38 and viii *seq.;* ŠUSTA, I., 164.

[4] *Cf.* THEINER, I., 677; RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 9; LE PLAT, V., 17 *seq.;* MENDOÇA, 636; MUSOTTI, *loc. cit.*, 6 *seq.* (January 20 is an error for 27; so is 28 in THEINER, *loc. cit.*).

[5] See THEINER, I., 678 *seq.* *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 15, 19. For the revision of the Index see Vol. XVI. of this work, Chap. I.

The Bishop of Fünfkirchen had at first to remain inactive, as he had arrived in Trent without mandate or instructions.[2] It was only on January 31st, when the Archbishop of Prague, Brus von Müglitz, one of the envoys who was to represent Ferdinand I. as Emperor, had arrived, that both the representatives of the Hapsburg were solemnly received in the General Congregation on February 6th.[3] The Portuguese envoy, Fernando Martinez de Mascareynas, arrived in Trent on February 7th.[4] In order to avoid disputes between the ecclesiastical and secular representatives of the princes, such as had already arisen between the Spanish and Portuguese envoys, the legates issued a table of precedence on February 8th.[5] The Portuguese envoy, who soon proved himself a loyal friend to the legates, was introduced at the General Congregation on the following day, and the second Imperial envoy, Sigismund von Thun, who had now also arrived, was introduced on February 10th.[6]

On February 13th the three representatives of Ferdinand I. handed to the legates a memorandum,[7] in which, in accordance with their instructions of January 1st,[1] the following requests were set forth: In order to avoid giving offence to the Protestants, it was desired that no pronouncement as to the continuation of the Council should be made at present; that the next Session should be postponed as long as possible; that questions of dogma should in the meantime be adjourned, and less important matters dealt with; a condemnation of the Confession of Augsburg should be avoided in drawing up the Index; the Protestants must receive safe-conduct in the widest sense of the term, and in the form which they themselves wished. The provisional reply of the legates to these demands was drawn up in very conciliatory terms.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* BONDONUS, 556; SICKEL, Berichte, I., 125; ŠUSTA, II., 14-5.

[2] See ŠUSTA, II., 17; KASSOWITZ, 39.

[3] See SICKEL, Konzil, 229; THEINER, I., 680; RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 10; LE PLAT, V., 19-22; BONDONUS, 557. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 15, 20.

[4] See THEINER, I., 681; BONDONUS, 557; GIULIANI, *loc. cit.*, 107 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, I., 95.

[5] RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 11; LE PLAT, V., 22 *seq.*; THEINER, I., 681 *seq.*

[6] RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 12-14; LE PLAT, V., 23-30; THEINER, I. 682-3; BONDONUS, 557.

[7] In RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 15-6; LE PLAT, V., 33-5.

On February 17th the legates admonished the fathers of the Council to keep secret the questions submitted to them for consideration; they were only to be made known when the decrees had been drawn up and published in the public Session.[3]

At the General Congregation of February 24th the Bishop of Fünfkirchen delivered his mandate as Hungarian envoy.[4] On the same day the Jubilee indulgence granted by the Pope in a brief of February 14th, was published.[5]

The XVIIIth Session, the second under Pius IV., was held on February 26th.[6] The five legates were present, with Cardinal Madruzzo of Trent, three patriarchs, sixteen archbishops, a hundred and five bishops, four abbots, five generals of orders, fifty theologians and four orators. High Mass was celebrated by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Antonio Elio, after which a sermon was preached by Antonio Cauco, Archbishop of Patras. Two decrees were published: one which announced the reform of the Index, and dealt with the invitation of all to the Council (De librorum delectu et omnibus ad concilium fide publica invitandis); in its second part it contained an invitation to the Protestants to present themselves at Trent, which was expressed in a noble spirit of peace;[1] by the second decree, the next Session of the Council was, in accordance with the wishes of the Emperor, postponed till May 14th. In order that the letter of safe-conduct for the Protestants should be granted as soon as possible, it was resolved that a General Congregation should have the power to issue this with full validity. They acted on this decision on March 2nd and 4th, and on the latter day the letter of safe-conduct was solemnly granted, which fact was made public on the 8th, by a notice affixed to the doors of the Cathedral in Trent. The designation "heretic" was in this replaced by the milder description "those who do not agree with us in faith, and believe otherwise than the Holy Roman Church teaches."[2]

---

[1] Printed in SICKEL, Konzil, 252-60. *Cf.* KRÖSS, 455 *seq.*; KASSOWITZ, 30 *seq.*; EDER, I., 107 *seq.*, 114 *seq.*, 127.

[2] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 17; LE PLAT, V., 35 *seq.* *Cf.* ŠUSTA, II., 23 *seq.*; SICKEL, Konzil, 269; EDER, I., 128.

[3] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 18; LE PLAT, V., 36; THEINER, I., 686 *seq.*

[4] See LE PLAT, V., 37-43; THEINER, I., 690.

[5] THEINER, I., 689. The Papal brief in LE PLAT, V., 43.

[6] *Cf.* RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 19-21; THEINER, I., 691; Musotti, in DÖLLINGER, Konzil, II., 9 *seq.*; *cf.* PALLAVICINI, 15, 21.

Pius IV. was most anxious that the Council should quickly be brought to completion by the immediate treatment of dogmatic questions. It was only after a consultation with five Cardinals that he had yielded to the request of the Emperor to postpone the next Session of the Council to a later date. A letter from Borromeo of February 20th gave permission for the next Session to be postponed till the beginning of May at the latest; in the meantime, in order to meet the wishes of the Emperor in this respect as well, they should not deal with dogma, but only with letters of safe-conduct and similar matters, as well as with several general points of reform; the Pope would himself undertake the reform of the

---

[1] The opinion of Knöpfler in the Freiburger Kirchenlex, XI., 2090.

[2] See Raynaldus, 1562, n. 22-3; Theiner, I., 692; Paleotto, in Theiner, II., 545 *seq.;* Musotti, *loc. cit.*, 10 *seq.;* report of the legates of March 9, in Šusta, II., 46; *Cf.* Pallavicini, 15, 1.

Curia.[1] After the legates had received these instructions on February 24th, they resolved, in the General Congregation of the 25th, to fix the next Session for May 14th.[2] At the same time as they informed the Pope of this, they made him a proposal that a special envoy should be sent to the Emperor, in order to prevent further delays.[3] The Pope agreed to this, and suggested that Commendone might be entrusted with this mission, when he came to Trent after the completion of his journey through Germany.[4] Commendone, who reached Trent on March 7th, was prepared to undertake this new task, but wished first to go to Venice for a few days.[5]

The position, however, had in the meantime been altered by the new demands presented by the Imperial envoys on March 5th: the reform of the German clergy was to be taken in hand at once, and a solemn invitation to the Council addressed to the Protestants.[6] The legates, in their reply,[7] made very reasonable objections to these demands; [8] the Pope also wished to refuse them, and was specially averse to the second one, for an invitation of the Protestants to the Council, which they did not recognize as such, would only lead to a further delay in its activities, without being of any other use, as the Protestants had already received an invitation, which they had only disregarded and despised. As it was now feared that the proposed envoy from the Council to the Emperor might be won over by the latter to his views, the Pope thought it wiser that the whole mission should if possible be given up.[1] This in fact was done; the legates resolved to make their representations to the Emperor, which were to have been entrusted to Commendone, through the nuncio, Delfino. However, before the letter to Delfino, drafted on April 2nd, was dispatched, a report from the nuncio, of March 30th, arrived in Trent on April 6th, which announced that the Emperor had withdrawn his demand for a postponement of the proceedings of the Council.[2] On March 29th the Pope gave instructions to the legates through Borromeo that they were no longer to delay the deliberations. Beginning with the next Session, they were to proceed to the treatment of questions of dogma, and thereby, though tacitly, and without any express declaration, the continuation would become an actual fact; the Spaniards would certainly be pleased to have this as an accomplished fact, while on the other hand all unnecessary offence would be avoided. The Pope also declared that, in the event of its being necessary, the highly controversial question whether the bishops' duty of residence was of divine or human institution, was admissible.[3] This difficult point had been raised when the legates, without waiting for the Pope's reply, had, on March 11th, begun the treatment of questions of reform by submitting twelve articles.[4]

---

[1] See Šusta, II., 31 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 32 *seq.*, the more confidential instructions to Simonetta. *Cf.* Eder, I., 129 *seq.*

[2] Theiner, I., 690.

[3] Letter of the legates of February 25, 1562, in Šusta, II., 37.

[4] Borromeo to the legates on March 8, 1562, in Šusta, II., 48 *seq.* *Cf.* Steinherz, III., 26.

[5] See Šusta, II., 52, 412.

[6] Le Plat, V., 102 *seq.* *Cf.* Steinherz, III., 26. For the date, March 5 (instead of 6) see Eder, I., 136 n. 1, and 147 *seq.*, as against Löwe, 87 *seq.*

[7] Of March 9, in Le Plat, V., 103.

[8] See Eder, I., 136. *Cf.* Sägmüller, Papstwahlbullen, 122.

At first it was only private discussions in which this important controversy came into the foreground, but soon it was being discussed with much heat in the widest circles.[5] Cardinal

---

[1] Borromeo to the legates on March 14, 1562, in ŠUSTA, II., 59.

[2] See STEINHERZ, III., 32-3.

[3] ŠUSTA, II., 71 *seq.* Already on March 18, Borromeo had given the legates instructions, so as to prevent unpleasantness, to avoid from any dispute about the "ius divinum residentiae," *ibid.*, 65.

[4] For the story of the origin of the important 12 articles on reform (in THEINER, I., 694; LE PLAT, V., 104) see ŠUSTA, II., 47. *Cf. ibid.*, 52 *seq.* for the proceedings of the legates, which could not be brought into accordance with the instructions received on March 12. See also EDER, I., 136 *seq.*

[5] *Cf.* Paleotto in THEINER, I., 550 *seq.*

Simonetta stood out from the first as the strong opponent of any definition of a divine law of the duty of residence; he stood above all his colleagues in knowledge of canon law,[1] and he clearly recognized the danger which this vexed question concealed; however, the wishes of Ferdinand's envoys weighed more in the end than these fears.[2]

In the latter half of March the real business of the Council had to a certain extent to give way to the solemn receptions and to the ceremonies of Holy Week.[3] On March 16th the envoy of the Spanish king, Fernando Francisco de Avalos, Marquis of Pescara, was received in the General Congregation;[4] on March 18th, the envoy of the Duke of Florence, Giovanni Strozzi;[5] on March 20th, the envoys of Catholic Switzerland, Melchior Lussy, chief magistrate of Unterwalden, as orator of the seven Catholic cantons, and Abbot Joachim Eichhorn of Einsiedeln, as procurator of the prelates and clergy of the seven cantons;[6] on April 6th, the procurators of the prelates and clergy of the kingdom of Hungary, Johann di Kolosváry, Bishop of Csanád, and Andreas Sbardelato Dudith, Bishop of Knin.[7]

The discussion, at first only of the first four reform articles, was now begun in the General Congregation of April 7th.[8]

---

[1] *Cf.* SICKEL, Berichte, I., 57.

[2] See EDER, I., 137-8.

[3] See ŠUSTA, II., 53, 64. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 16, 4, 2.

[4] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 32-4; LE PLAT, V., 105-10. *Cf.* THEINER, I., 694 *seq.*; BONDONUS, 558-9. See also ŠUSTA, I., 313, on the provisional appointment of Pescara.

[5] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 35-7; LE PLAT, V., 110-6. *Cf.* THEINER, I., 695; ŠUSTA, II., 53 *seq.*

[6] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 38-9; LE PLAT, V., 116-24. *Cf.* THEINER, I., 695; MAYER, Konzil und Gegensreformation, I., 50 *seqq.*

[7] See LE PLAT, V., 138-46. *Cf.* THEINER, I., 696; ŠUSTA, II., 74 *seq.* On April 25 the envoys of the Republic of Venice, Niccolò da Ponte and Matteo Dandolo, were received. See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 42; LE PLAT, V., 159-62. *Cf.* THEINER, I., 714; ŠUSTA, II., 61.

[8] See THEINER, I., 696 *seqq.*; Paleotto in THEINER, II., 552 *seq.* *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 16, 4 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, II., 77 *seq.*

It then happened that, at the first article, the Archbishop of Granada, Pedro Guerrero, who was the principal spokesman of the Spaniards, asked for a decision of the question which was so variously interpreted by theologians, whether the duty of residence had its origin in divine or in human law. Whoever voted on this question with the Archbishop of Granada, in favour of the divine law, at the same time pronounced in favour of the opinion that in the episcopal consecration there was immediately conferred by God a certain though still indeterminate power of government, while the Pope, in conferring a bishopric, did no more than designate the person to whom this power of government was applied. This, however, was contested by many, and on account of the deeply-rooted differences of opinion, the discussions proved to be as long as they were stormy.[1] In the discussions most of the Spaniards, filled with zeal for the defence and consolidation of the episcopal dignity, spoke in favour of the divine right; they hoped from this to be able to gain a strengthening of episcopal jurisdiction as against the central power of the Pope and a limitation of Roman dispensations. Beyond this practical object the matter had also a very wide importance on the ground of principle. It was not only a question of words, as some later believed who had only considered the matter superficially.[2] What was being discussed was rather a matter of profound theology, upon the answer to which the most important consequences depended. The controversy affected the innermost constitution of the Church, and involved in itself the old antithesis between the Papal and episcopal systems. Cardinal Simonetta saw very clearly the weapon against the Papal primacy contained in the theory of the Spaniards, as well as the danger which would follow an affirmative decision. A definition of the divine right, so he feared, would not only give the Protestants an opening for fresh attacks upon the Curia, but would also injure important interests of the Holy See, both in reality and in theory; it would bind the hands of the Pope and would create an important prejudice in favour of the superiority of the Council. Because he did not wish to see the ancient and essential rights of the Roman primacy lessened, Simonetta did everything in his power to avert this danger.[1] His forebodings were only shared by Hosius, and not by Gonzaga and Seripando. For the rest, it was almost entirely Italian prelates who were on his side, and their authority was weakened by the fact that, on account of their poverty, they received pecuniary support from the Curia, in consequence of which they did not appear to be independent.[2]

---

[1] Hitherto the General Congregation had been held at the residence of Cardinal Gonzaga, the Palazzo Thun; the much greater number of those taking part, as well as the increasing heat of the season, were the reasons why, after April 13, the church of S. Maria Maggiore was chosen for the place of meeting. GIUILANI, 96. *Cf.* also EHSES, VIII., 440 n. 2, and 513 n. 2. From April 25 to May 26, 1562, the Congregations were held in the Cathedral.

[2] *Cf.* GRISAR, Frage des päpstl. Primates, 454 *seq.*, 784.

How greatly the views on this subject, which, in default of any binding definition on the part of the Church, was still an open one, were in need of being cleared up, appeared in the voting which took place in the General Congregation on April 20th, on the question whether the duty of residence was to be defined as being based on divine institution. It had been settled that the question was to be answered by a simple "yes" or "no." As many did not keep to this, a confusion arose which is reflected to this day in the very discrepant statements given by the various authorities. According to the notes made by Seripando, 67 fathers answered with a simple "yes," and 33 with a simple "no;" 38 gave a conditional vote; some of these voted in the affirmative, if the Pope were first asked for his opinion, others in the negative, if the Pope were not asked; Cardinal Madruzzo remarked that he would abide by what he had said in a previous session; the Bishop of Budua said that he approved of its publication.

---

[1] *Cf.* Šusta, II., 70, 89, 124 *seq.;* Eder, I., 142. See also Paleotto in Theiner, II., 555.

[2] See Eder, I., 142.

The Benedictine Abbots answered in various ways, the question then arising as to whether they were to have only one vote, as in the time of Paul III.[1] The result therefore was simply that a bare majority would come to no decision until the Pope had given his opinion on the question. The session had been more excited than any held so far. The noise and strife, said Musotti, was so great that the avoidance of a schism could only be ascribed to a miracle.[2]

The confusion was still further increased by disunion among the legates. After the voting, Cardinal Gonzaga was inclined to count the votes of those who said "yes, with the assent of the Pope," with the votes of those who wished for a definition of the divine right unconditionally, and then to proceed without further ceremony, but as Cardinals Simonetta and Hosius justly protested, he was obliged to give up the idea.[3]

The legates sent a petition to the Pope on the very day of the session, that in view of the divergence of opinion, he would decide the matter himself.[4] Three days later, Gonzaga and Seripando sent a kind of minority vote to Rome, in which the sending of such messages to the Pope was deprecated, because the idea that there was a want of freedom in the Council would be strengthened among the Protestants as well as among many Catholics. Gonzaga and Seripando therefore advised that the Pope should refrain from making a decision, and should admonish the prelates to settle the matter according to their consciences.[1]

---

[1] SERIPANDI Comment., 484-5. Concerning the different computations in other authorities, *cf.* DRUFFEL in the Theol. Lit.-Blatt., 1876, 484. MERKLE, who has discovered the manuscript remains of Paleotto (see Röm. Quartalschrift, XI., 335 *seq.*) in the Isolani Archives at Bologna, promises (Concil., II., 639) an exact edition of each voting from the original diary of Paleotto. See also the complete conciliar *Acta* from April 7 to 20, together with numerous original votes, hitherto unknown, in EHSES, VIII., 402-65.

[2] DÖLLINGER, Tagebücher, II., 12. See also Paleotto in THEINER, II., 554 *seq.*

[3] See ŠUSTA, II., 90.

[4] *Ibid.*, 88.

On the same April 20th a commission was appointed to draw up a decree embodying the points of reform already dealt with. From April 21st to the 24th, six more of the twelve articles were discussed. On April 28th, a letter from the French envoy, Lansac, was read, in which he announced his arrival, but begged that the Session of May 14th might be postponed, as he could not be in Trent by then.[2] Almost all the Spanish prelates protested against a postponement of the Session, but they were by no means in the majority. At length a way was found to please both parties; it was resolved on April 30th to hold the Session fixed for May 14th on that day, but only to read the mandates of the newly arrived envoys; the publication of the decrees already determined on was to take place at a Session to be held eight days later.[3]

About this time various circumstances contributed to render the position of the Council exceedingly difficult, not the least of which were the many acts of interference on the part of the princes and their representatives. The matter of the continuation on the one hand, and the question as to the duty of residence on the other, were the subjects which disturbed the peaceful carrying on of the deliberations.

The Spanish ambassador in Rome, Vargas, had handed an autograph letter from his master to the Pope on April 19th, making at the same time a protest, both verbally and in writing, against the exclusive right of the legates to bring forward proposals, and against the postponement of the explicit declaration of continuation.[4] Cardinal Borromeo informed the legates of this on April 25th, and three days later Pius IV. wrote to them that he had given the Portuguese ambassador, Lorenzo Perez, who was returning home, a commission to Philip II. to vindicate the Papal policy with regard to the Council.[1] The legates, on their part, drew up for Philip II. on May 7th, a detailed memorandum of vindication concerning the questions contested by Spain.[2] They also informed Cardinal Borromeo on May 7th that they had intended to declare the continuation explicitly at the next Session, but that as the Imperial envoys had urgently protested against this only the day before, they were still undecided what course to pursue.[3] The representatives of Ferdinand I. again protested on May 8th against the words in the draft of the decree of prorogation fixed for the next Session, which they thought might be understood as a declaration of continuation. A corresponding alteration was accordingly made.[4] On May 10th the Spanish envoy, the Marquis of Pescara, had returned to Trent; he brought fresh instructions from Philip II. which urgently demanded an explicit declaration of continuation. The Imperial envoys were equally insistent on the other side. On May 12th it was agreed that in the Session immediately following (May 14th), they would merely publish a decree postponing the next Session from May 21st to June 4th; they must abstain from any declaration of continuation, but the legates must give the Spanish envoy hopes of this being made in the Session in June. By this postponement of the Session the Imperial envoys gained time to seek further instructions from Ferdinand I.[5]

---

[1] The letter of Gonzaga and Seripando of April 23, 1562, unfortunately only preserved in a summary, in Šusta, II., 90 *seq.*

[2] See Raynaldus, 1562, n. 44; Le Plat, V., 162. *Cf.* Theiner, I., 714 *seq.*

[3] See Pallavicini, 16, 5, 13. All the material concerning the Congregations and Sessions down to the XXIInd. on September 17, 1562, is now in a detailed edition in Ehses, VIII.

[4] See Döllinger, Beiträge, I., 415; Collección de docum. inéd., IX., 141. The autograph letter of Philip II., of March 30, 1562, in Šusta, II., 94 *seq.*

In Rome, on May 12th, the French ambassador, in conjunction with Abbot Niquet of St. Gildas, who had arrived from France, presented to the Pope from their government a fresh request for the postponement of the proceedings of the

---

[1] See Šusta, II., 93 *seq.*, 98 *seq.*

[2] Collección de docum. inéd., IX., 161 *seq.* *Cf.* also Šusta, II., 102 *seq.*

[3] Šusta, II., 101 *seq.*

[4] Šusta, I., 104 *seq.*

[5] See Šusta, II., 123 *seq.*; Eder, I., 147.

Council.[1] The Pope was unwilling to agree to this, and since he was being continually urged by the Spanish ambassador to proclaim the continuation,[2] he instructed the legates on May 13th to proceed with the discussion in the Council of matters of dogma and reform as an express continuation of the Council of Trent, without paying any attention to the remonstrances which were to be expected from France and elsewhere.[3]

At Trent, on May 14th, in the XIXth Session, the third under Pius IV., as had been agreed, nothing was done beyond the publication of the decree of postponement to the 4th of June, and the reading of the mandates. The legates, Cardinal Madruzzo, three patriarchs, eighteen archbishops, a hundred and thirty-one bishops, two abbots, four generals of orders, twenty-two theologians and eight orators (among them the envoy of Duke Albert V. of Bavaria, who had arrived on May 1st) were present.[4]

Three days before the XIXth Session the developments in the controversy as to the duty of residence had led the Pope to make an important pronouncement.

Since they were not in possession of sufficient information for the treatment of the questions of reform, the legates had already, on April 11th, sent to Rome a confidential messenger in the person of Federigo Pendaso, who was to find out the wishes of the Pope, especially in the matter of the duty of residence.[5] Pendaso had arrived in the Eternal City on April 20th,[6] but his return was so long delayed that reports were current of the imminent translation of the Council, or of its sudden ending.[1] No such plans, however, were contemplated. The cause of the delay was the embarrassment of the Pope as to the attitude he should adopt with regard to the question of the duty of residence, as to which such great differences of opinion prevailed among the fathers. In view of the great number who held that opinion, and the attitude of Vargas, a plain rejection of the divine authority for the duty of residence did not seem to be opportune, especially because many saw in a declaration of the divine right one of the most efficacious means of restoring ecclesiastical discipline, now so fallen into decay, and thus they would incur the suspicion that the Curia was seeking to thwart the work of reform. Above all, however, the most vital interests of the Holy See were involved in the question. If he gave way, he would have to bear in mind that those fathers who had spoken out openly against the definition, thinking thereby to render an important service to the Pope, must not lightly be thrown over. A hurried definition was therefore to be avoided, because the laying down of an article of faith called for complete security, and of that, in the face of such violent opposition, there could be no question.[2]

---

[1] See Šusta, II., 155.

[2] See Vargas to Philip II. on May 4, 1562, in Döllinger, Beiträge, II., 415 *seq.*

[3] Šusta, II., 155. "Le cose del concilio la (S. S^{tà}] travagliano anco molto," *reports Fr. Tonina on May 13, 1562 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[4] See Raynaldus, 1562, n. 44; Theiner, I., 717. Concerning the Bavarian envoys, Dr. Augustin Paumgartner and Jean Couvillon S. J. see Knöpfler, Kelchbewegung, 100; Riezler, IV., 513; Canisii Epist., 450, 562.

[5] *Cf.* Susta, II., 78-82, and Merkle, II., 483 *seq.*

[6] See Arco's report in Sickel, Konzil, 293.

On account of the difficulties which stood in the way of a definite decision, either in one sense or the other, Pius IV. thought it best to leave the question open for the time being, and to send Pendaso back to Trent only with decisions as to the reforms that were to be undertaken (May 3rd).[3] When he was near Mantua, Pendaso injured himself by a fall from his horse to such a degree that he was unable to continue his journey. He therefore dictated to Giovanni Francesco Arrivabene, who had been sent to meet him by the legates, his instructions, which were to the following effect: the Pope is resolved on the reform of the whole Church, and especially of the Roman Curia. That of the Penitentiaria is already in hand, and that of the other offices will follow, in spite of the financial losses involved. The Pope earnestly admonished the legates to proceed with all possible moderation, lest the movement for reform within the Church, instead of contributing to the salvation of Christendom, should degenerate into a mere upsetting of the existing order ; they were not lightly to lend an ear to every claim and request, but to proceed in agreement with the head of the Church. With regard to the question of residence, the Pope still reserved a decisive definition ; in view of the differences of opinion among the fathers, and the prevailing excitement, it would be better to wait for a more favourable and a calmer time.[1]

---

[1] See Collección de docum. inéd., IX., 151.

[2] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 16, 5.

[3] See ŠUSTA, II., 108.

Besides these instructions, Pendaso was the bearer of 95 articles of reform, furnished with notes by the Pope himself, which had been drawn up by the private secretary of Pius IV., on the basis of the reform libellum of the Spanish prelates, which had been sent to Rome by Simonetta on April 6th.[2] In the meantime, Simonetta, by his expostulations, had been successful in inducing his colleagues to leave on one side the question of residence, and to treat of it only in connection with the discussion of the Sacrament of Holy Orders. This was reported to Cardinal Borromeo by the legates on May 11th.[3]

But in the meantime a change of opinion had been brought about in the mind of Pius IV. Reports from various correspondents painted the disunion and confusion at Trent in such vivid colours that the whole Curia was stirred to its depths. The Pope's mind was disturbed more and more by the secret warnings which reached him in great numbers, which came to him partly directly, and partly through Borromeo, from fathers of the Council who were known to be zealous partisans of the Holy See. A profound impression was made by several reports from Simonetta, who had from the first been definitely opposed to the declaration that the duty of residence was founded on divine right. The zeal of the Cardinal, as well as his wide knowledge of canon law, were bound to place his opinion above suspicion, and to give real justification to his apprehension of dangers, which the eyes of the other legates had not detected. In addition to this there had come to Rome other communications, which not only exaggerated, but even distorted occurrences which had taken place in Trent; among these there were even angry calumnies against Cardinals Gonzaga and Seripando.[1]

---

[1] See Šusta, II., 109 *seq.* Concerning the reforms at Rome, which related especially to the Penitentiaria and the Apostolic Camera, see, besides Sickel, Konzil, 298 *seq.*, 310, and Sägmüller, Papstwahlbullen, 128, the *statements of Tonina (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua) and the *Avvisi di Roma (Vatican Library) in Appendix Nos. 20—33. For the constitution of May 4, 1562 (Bull. Rom., VII., 193 *seq.*), which was the first attempt to alter the Penitentiaria, and to limit its powers, see Göller, II., 113 *seq.*

[2] Published in accordance with a manuscript of Seripando, in Šusta, II., 113 *seqq.*

[3] Šusta, II., 121 *seq.*, 126.

Pius IV. considered the matter of such grave importance that, contrary to his usual custom, he sought counsel from the Cardinals. He formed six of them into a special commission,[2] and a consultation with them led to the conclusion that the Pope could no longer maintain his former attitude of reserve.[3] A resolution was therefore come to, to avert the dangers that threatened at Trent by an extraordinary step: to associate with the legates who were there three new ones; Cardinals Cicada, de la Bourdaisière, and Navagero were proposed for this office. Cicada seemed to be especially suited for the defence of the rights of the Holy See, as not only was he distinguished for his great knowledge of canon law, but also for his great intrepidity. Bourdaisière, as Bishop of Angoulême, had always shown great zeal for religion, and as the ambassador of France to the Holy See he had won in a high degree the good-will and confidence of the Pope; he would be in a position to render valuable services in averting the difficulties which were to be feared from the French government. Navagero, too, possessed, in addition to a truly ecclesiastical spirit, great diplomatic skill, of which he had given proofs as Venetian ambassador at different courts, and finally in Rome. It might therefore be hoped that he would be successful in restoring harmony among the legates.[1]

---

[1] See the testimony of Borromeo in his letter to Gonzaga of May 11, 1562, in Šusta, II., 140, and Paleotto in Theiner, II., 558-9. *Cf.* Pallavicini, 16, 5 and 8.

[2] See Paleotto, *loc. cit.*, 559.

[3] See Eder, I., 145.

Pius IV., in his own vigorous way, informed the legates of his intention on May 11th. He did not refrain from making bitter reproaches to them on account of their want of unity in treating the question of the duty of residence. They should have prevented this complicated question, which had already been postponed in the time of Paul III. from being made a subject of discussion, especially as they themselves were not of one mind regarding it. "Remember," he wrote, "that you are all legates together, and that you must proceed in complete agreement, instead of causing scandal by disunion." In addition to this exhortation to harmony, he repeated in his letter the declaration that the matter of the duty of residence must be adjourned for the present, and the treatment of dogma and reform proceeded with instead, without delay.[2]

The legates, who received this letter on May 15th, answered two days later; they would do their utmost, and hoped to succeed in postponing the question of the duty of residence at least until the treatment of Holy Orders; against the reproach of disunion they attempted to justify themselves.[3] Cardinals Gonzaga and Seripando, who understood quite well that the reproaches of the angry Pope were chiefly directed against themselves, addressed special letters of justification to Cardinal Borromeo on May 16th and 17th, which left nothing to be desired from the point of view of frankness.[4] Cardinal Gonzaga at the same time announced his intention of leaving Trent as soon as Cicada, to whom, because of his seniority, the presidentship of the legatine college must belong, had arrived. It was only after the Pope had given up the proposed mission of new legates, that the deeply offended Cardinal of Mantua allowed himself to be persuaded to remain for the time being.[1]

---

[1] See PALLAVICINI, 16, 8, 12.

[2] ŠUSTA (II., 134 *seq.*) by making use of the previous drafts has cleared up in a masterly way the genesis of the Papal letter of May 11, 1562.

[3] See ŠUSTA, II., 152.

[4] Gonzaga's letter in ŠUSTA, II., 143 *seqq.*, that of Seripando in SICKEL, Berichte, II., 108 *seq.*

On May 25th the legates submitted to the fathers of the Council, as the result of the deliberations which had taken place so far, the draft of a decree, in nine reform canons, to be published at the next Session.[2] On the same day they reported to Rome the ill-success of their negotiations with the Spaniards, who demanded that the question of the duty of residence should be decided at the next Session, or, if that were not possible, either that the Session should be delayed, or that they should have a promise that the matter should be decided at the following one.[3] It was only with great difficulty that Mendoça, Bishop of Salamanca, who, by arrangement with the legates, had undertaken the task of mediation, succeeded in dissuading the leader of the Spanish prelates, the Archbishop of Granada, from his purpose of making a protest against the postponement of the question.[4] Besides this the Spaniards insisted, as they had done previously, that the Council should be expressly declared to be a continuation of the former Council of Trent. In this connection the situation was further aggravated by the unmannerly attitude taken up by the French envoys, whose leader, de Lansac, the confidant of Catherine de' Medici, reached Trent on May 18th. A few days later, his two colleagues, Arnaud du Ferrier, President of the Parliament of Paris, and Gui du Faur de Pibrac, Chief Justice of Toulouse, both of whom were suspected of heresy, also arrived.[5] The representatives of France were received at a General Congregation on May 26th; they came with a demand that the Council should be expressly declared to be a new one, and not a continuation. At the same time a letter, dated May 22nd, arrived from Ferdinand I. to his envoys, and another from Delfino to the legates, announcing that the Emperor not only refused his consent to an express declaration of continuation, but threatening, if this were made, to recall his representatives.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* Šusta, II., 180.

[2] See Theiner, I., 718-22; Le Plat, V., 186-9.

[3] Šusta, II., 161 *seq.*

[4] See Mendoça, 642 *seq.*

[5] *Cf.* Raynaldus, 1562, n, 44-6; Le Plat, V., 175-85; Theiner I., 720 *seq.*; Bondonus, 560; Pallavicini, 16, 10 and 11; Baguenault de Puchesse, 63 *seq.*

The legates, who reported the attitude taken up by the Emperor to Rome on May 26th,[2] had reason to fear the dissolution of the Council. While they were still seeking to find a way out of this exceedingly difficult position, they received, on the evening of June 2nd, a letter from Pius IV., dated May 30th,[3] which filled them with dismay, for it contained express orders that, in accordance with the promise made to the Spanish king, they were to hold to the express declaration of continuation which had already been ordained. The legates were convinced that the carrying out of this command would not only lead to the dissolution of the Council, but would also, since the representative of Spain, the Marquis of Pescara, had agreed to a postponement, throw the whole blame for this upon the Pope.[4] They therefore resolved not to carry out the order, which had been issued under the influence of Vargas,[5] and to justify this step in Rome through Cardinal Mark Sittich. His mission, however, was not required, as, on the following day, a second letter from the Pope arrived, dated May 31st, which revoked the first one, and left it to the discretion of the legates to refrain from making an express declaration of continuation at the next Session, so long as the actual carrying on of the labours of the Council was taken in hand.[6]

---

[1] See SICKEL, Konzil, 314; STEINHERZ, III., 52 *seq.*

[2] ŠUSTA, II., 164 *seq.*

[3] ŠUSTA, II., 175 *seq.* *Cf.* SICKEL, Berichte, III., 131.

[4] See SERIPANDI Comment., 467; MUSOTTI, I., 15 *seq.*; Paleotto in THEINER, II., 560. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 16, 12, 2 and 3. See also SICKEL, Berichte, III., 138 *seq.*

[5] *Cf.* Colección de docum. inéd., IX., 232 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, II., 178.

[6] See ŠUSTA, II., 180 *seq.*, 183, 471. Tonina *reported on May 20, 1562, that the Pope held congregations about the Council every day (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

After the necessary preparations had been made in the General Congregation of June 3rd, the XXth Session, the fourth under Pius IV. was held on June 4th. At this assembly, all the legates, with the exception of Gonzaga, were present, as well as Cardinal Madruzzo, two patriarchs, eighteen archbishops, a hundred and thirty-seven bishops, two abbots, four generals of orders, twenty-eight theologians, and eleven orators. High Mass was celebrated by Bishop Mendoça of Salamanca, and the sermon was preached by the Bishop of Famagosta, Girolamo Ragazzoni. On account of the difficulties caused by the questions of residence and continuation, no decrees were published, only the mandates of the Swiss, Salzburg, and French orators and procurators being read, and a decree of prorogation, which fixed the next Session for June 16th. The greater number of the fathers accepted this decree, but thirty-eight raised an objection to the omission of any mention of the duty of residence and continuation.[1]

In the General Congregation of June 6th, Cardinal Gonzaga submitted, as the subject of the next dogmatic decree, five articles on Communion in both kinds, and the Communion of children.[2] Thirty-one bishops declared their agreement to this proposal, but only on condition that the duty of residence should also be dealt with. The same minority also addressed a very outspoken petition to the Pope on the same day, in which they defended their position with regard to the duty of residence as a divine command, and protested against the tendency ascribed to them of intending to undermine the authority of the Holy See.[3] Pius IV. replied on July 1st that it was his desire that freedom of speech and discussion should exist in the Council, but at the same time he warned the fathers against divisions and discord, so as not to give the Protestants an excuse to revile and disparage the Council.[4]

---

[1] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 47, 48; THEINER, II., 1 *seq.*; SERIPANDI Comment., 488. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 16, 12, 9-12.

[2] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 49; LE PLAT, V., 202; THEINER, II., 7. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 17, 1.

[3] LE PLAT, V., 199-200.

[4] *Ibid.*, 360 *seq.*

The five articles were minutely examined and discussed from every point of view by sixty-three theologians, in twenty-one meetings, from June 10th to the 23rd.[1] In spite of differences of opinion as to several points, an unanimous agreement was arrived at with regard to the principal question; that Communion under both kinds was not of divine precept, except for the celebrating priest; the Church had the power, for sufficient reasons, to prescribe Communion under the form of bread alone, for the laity and for the clergy when not celebrating; Christ was entirely present under the one kind; Communion was not necessary for very small children. Very different opinions were elicited with regard to the third of the five articles, which dealt with the granting of the chalice to the laity. It was therefore postponed for the time being, and upon the remaining points four canons were formulated and submitted to the fathers of the Council on July 23rd. They discussed these in six General Congregations from June 30th to July 3rd. Cardinal Simonetta, together with three bishops and the General of the Dominicans, drew up a new statement of the four canons, based on these discussions, with a view to further elucidation and argument. Hosius and Seripando, with three bishops and the General of the Augustinians, drew up a detailed statement of doctrine.[2] All this was laid before the fathers of the Council in General Congregation on July 4th; these deliberated upon it on July 8th and 9th, so that on July 14th the final version could be drawn up.

---

[1] For the discussions up to the formulation of the dogmatic decree of the XXIst Session, see THEINER, II., 7-51; LE PLAT, V., 272-328. EHSES (VIII., 537-617, 633-50, 691) gives all the *Acta* from June 10 to July 14, 1562. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 17, 6-7 and 11; KNÖPFLER in the Freiburger Kirchenlexikon, XI., 2094, and GRISAR, Lainez, 684. *Cf.* also CAVALLERA, L'interprétation du chap. VI de St. Jean. Une controverse exégét. au Concile de Trente, in the Revue d' hist. ecclés., X. (1909), 687-709. Concerning the vote of P. Canisius with regard to the chalice for the laity (June 15, 1562) see EHSES, in the Hist. Jahrbuch, XXXVI., 105 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* CAVALLERA, *loc. cit.*, 699.

During these dogmatic discussions, the legates were still engaged with other matters which caused them much anxiety. On June 6th the Imperial envoys had handed to them the so-called reform libellum of Ferdinand I.[1] This comprehensive document was the outcome of the discussions of the Imperial councillors upon the articles of reform which had been submitted by the legates to the Council on March 11th, and which did not seem to them to be sufficient.

The reform libellum of Ferdinand I. embraces the Imperial demands and proposals with regard to ecclesiastical reform. It attempts first of all to demonstrate the necessity of a radical reform of the clergy before the decision of controverted points of doctrine. Then follow fifteen articles on the amendment of the clergy in their head and their members. In these there is to be found a vigorous demand for the reform of the Pope and the Curia, the limitation of the members of the College of Cardinals to twenty-four, in the spirit of the decisions of the Council of Basle, the limitation of Papal dispensations and monastic exemptions, the prohibition of benefices, the observance of the duty of residence, the severe punishment of simony, the limitation of ordinances which bind under pain of mortal sin, moderation in the infliction of excommunication, the removal of abuses in the forms of worship, the expurgation from the missal and breviary of useless and legendary matter, and the use of singing in the vernacular in divine worship. To these were added requests for the granting of the chalice to the laity, the abolition of the law of fasting, and for permission for priests to marry. The libellum went on to state that, even though all these concessions were not sought by all the nations, it was quite a different matter for the German peoples, whose special infirmities called for special remedies. If the Church, like a good mother, would be indulgent in these points, then most people hoped that at any rate the Catholics who still remained could be preserved from heresy. It was also necessary to draw up a clear summary of Catholic doctrine, as well as a new collection of homilies, and also to establish seminaries for the education and training of a good clergy. After this came the advice that, as far as the Church property which had been seized by the Protestants was concerned, a liberal attitude should be adopted, as it could not be hoped that the apostates would return to union with the Church if restitution of that property was insisted on ; dangerous points of controversy should also be avoided as far as possible, as for example that on the duty of residence.

---

[1] It was sent on May 22 and arrived in Trent on the 26, but on account of the difficulties about the negotiations concerning the continuation, it was still being kept back. This important document was only published for the first time in the XVIIIth century by SCHELHORN (Amoenit., I., 501-75), and afterwards by LE PLAT (V., 232-59). It has aroused much interest among modern historians. *Cf.* REIMANN in the Forschungen zur deutschen Gesch., VIII. (1868), 177-86; SICKEL in the Archiv für österr. Gesch., XIV. (1871), 1-96; TURBA in Venezian. Depeschen, III., 270 *seq.*; STEINHERZ, III., 65 *seq.*; SÄGMÜLLER, Päpstwahlbullen 125 *seq.*, 164; RITTER, I., 157 *seqq.*; KASSOWITZ, 58 *seq.*; HELLE, 7 *seq.*, 16, and especially EDER, who (I., 232) comes to the following conclusion with regard to the story of the origin of the libellum: the initiative and certainly also the general outline of the thesis can be traced to Ferdinand himself. The basis of the material for its carrying out was provided by the Imperial councillor Georg Gienger, the final form came from the well-known theologian, Federico Stafilo, who added much material; it was approved, and brought into harmony with the Imperial policy with regard to the Council by the vice-chancellor, Sigismund Seld, who also contributed something to its contents; Urban, Bishop of Gurk, Cordova, the confessor of the wife of Maximilian II., and Cithard, Ferdinand's confessor, only took a subordinate part in it. Just as a number of influential persons had co-operated in the composition of the little work, so various important documents connected with ecclesiastical reform were made use of in it.

The ecclesiastical policy of Ferdinand had found complete expression in his reform libellum. The good intentions of the Emperor stand out clearly in it, especially his anxiety to put a barrier in the way of the religious innovations, not only by the removal of ecclesiastical abuses, which were so alarmingly on the increase in his dominions, but also by far-reaching concessions. While we may fully appreciate the subjective aims of Ferdinand, the objective value of his proposals for reform must be strictly investigated, and it is very evident that not a few of them were dangerous and went much too far. The practical usefulness of the important concessions demanded with regard to the chalice for the laity and the marriage of priests, was by no means proved by the arguments brought forward by the Emperor, but was rather open to very weighty objections.

At their first perusal of the reform libellum there rose in the minds of the legates the remembrance of the Council of Basle, of unhappy memory. In consternation at the extent of the Imperial demands and proposals, they at once, without waiting to consult Rome, begged the representatives of Ferdinand to refrain for the present from bringing the document before the General Congregation. On June 8th they wrote to the nuncio, Delfino, to beg Ferdinand I. to withdraw or change the document, as to submit it would certainly entail the dissolution of the Council. As for the claims for the reform of the Pope by the Council, of the head by the members, the nuncio might remind the Emperor of the fatal confusion of the XVth century.[1] One of the Imperial envoys, Archbishop Brus, who returned to Prague from Trent on June 10th, also received instructions from the legates to influence the Emperor in this sense.[2]

The negotiations of Delfino with Ferdinand I. had a successful issue. At the end of June the nuncio was able to inform the legates that the Emperor appreciated their objections, and left it to their judgment to submit the libellum, either complete or in part, to the fathers of the Council at a suitable moment.[3] On June 29th the Emperor himself wrote to the legates that he did not wish to dispute their right of bringing forward proposals; if the articles in the libellum were too numerous to be dealt with at one time, he would be satisfied if they were dealt with by degrees. With regard to the reform of the head of the Church, he gave the wholly satisfactory assurance that he had only meant that the Pope should carry this out himself.[1] On June 27th, the Imperial envoys had handed a memorial to the General Congregation of the Council, setting forth the reasons why the chalice for the laity was requested for the Imperial dominions.[2] The Bavarian envoy, Augustinus Paumgartner, was introduced in the same General Congregation. He made a speech in which he put forward three claims in the name of Duke Albert V.: the reform of the clergy, the chalice for the laity, and permission for married persons to receive Holy Orders.[3] At the General Congregation of July 4th, the French envoys also submitted a document supporting the demand of the Emperor for the chalice for the laity.[4] It would seem that the very insistence from such various quarters led many, who had before not been unwilling to grant such a concession, to be doubtful. The legates themselves held different views, and sought, by means of negotiations, to have the question set aside.[5] Ferdinand's representatives, however, Thun and Draskovich, obstinately persisted, even with threats, in their demand. They insisted on the postponement of the Session, and the adjournment of the articles prepared for publication, if the question of the chalice for the laity could not be decided at once. The legates, however, insisted that the Session must be held, and the four articles prepared published. At length the Imperial envoys gave way on condition that a declaration should be made in the Session, that the two articles dealing with the granting of the chalice, which were now postponed, should be dealt with later, at a more suitable time, by the Council, which time was to be when the envoys thought best.

---

[1] Steinherz, III., 61 *seq.* *Cf.* Šusta, II., 184.

[2] See Kassowitz, 81 *seq.*; Steinherz, III., 84; Šusta, II., 190 *seq.*

[3] See Steinherz, III., 69 *seq.*, 76 *seq.*, *cf.* 81 *seq.*; Kassowitz, 80 *seq.*

---

[1] RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 61. LE PLAT, V., 351-60. *Cf.* also STEINHERZ, III., 87 *seq.*, and HELLE, 31 *seq.* The Pope came to an understanding with Arco, and caused instructions to be sent to the legates to select from the Imperial libellum the suitable articles and to present them to the Council; see STEINHERZ, III., 99 *seq.*

[2] RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 65; LE PLAT, V., 346-50.

[3] See THEINER, II., 39 *seq.* RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 52-4; LE PLAT, V., 335-45. *Cf.* KNÖPFLER, Kelchbewegung, 96 *seq.*

[4] RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 66. LE PLAT, V., 366 *seq.* *Cf.* THEINER II., 45.

[5] See the report of Thun and Draskovich of July 7, 1562, in SICKEL, Konzil, 347-9. *Cf.* the report of the legates of July 9 in ŠUSTA, II., 221 *seq.*

On July 10th they resumed the discussion of the nine reform articles which had been prepared up to May 25th, which during the days that followed were examined anew in four General Congregations, so that on July 15th a reform decree could be formulated.[1]

On the appointed day, July 16th, the XXIst public Session of the Council, the fifth under Pius IV., was held. The Archbishop of Spalato, Marco Cornaro, celebrated High Mass, and the Hungarian bishop, Andreas Sbardelato Dudith, preached. In this Session the five legates, Cardinal Madruzzo, three patriarchs, nineteen archbishops, a hundred and forty-eight bishops, four abbots, six generals of orders, seventy-one theologians and ten envoys took part. The decrees concerning Communion under both kinds, and of children, in four articles and as many canons, were published and the announcement was made that the two articles dealing with the chalice for the laity would be treated later on. The reform decree which was then promulgated included nine chapters: it laid down that ordination and dimissorial letters should be granted gratuitously; no one was to be ordained without assured means of support; in very extensive parishes assistant priests were to be appointed, or new parishes formed, though with sufficient endowments, or, when necessary, several small parishes could be united into one; ignorant parish priests were to have vicars assigned to them, to whom part of their revenues must be allotted, and all such as led a scandalous life were to be punished, and if necessary deposed. It was further ordained that the revenues of churches which were in a ruinous state were to be transferred to others, or the said churches put into a proper condition. Monasteries held in commendam, and in which the rules of no Order were observed, as well as all secular and regular benefices, were to be subject to an annual visitation by the bishop, as well as all monasteries where regular observance was still in force, in cases where the superiors were not fulfilling their duty. Finally, in order to abolish once and for all the abuses in connection with the publication of indulgences, it was laid down that, in the first place the name and office of the collector of the indulgence was to be suppressed, and the publication of all indulgences and spiritual favours was to be entrusted to the bishops, who, with two members of the cathedral chapter, should receive the voluntary offerings of the faithful, so that all might know that the treasury of the Church was opened for reasons of piety and not of gain. These reform decrees were accepted by all, with the exception of seven of the bishops, who desired some unimportant alterations. The decree which fixed the next Session for September 17th was received with general approval.[1]

---

[1] See THEINER, II., 51-5; Paleotto in THEINER, II., 565 *seq.*

Soon after the fifth Session, an occurrence took place which was of great importance for the further progress of the Council; this was the restoration of unity among the legates. Ever since May, strained relations had existed among them, especially between Cardinals Gonzaga and Simonetta; these had originated in their difference of opinion on the subject of the duty of residence. This question, as well as the disturbing reports of an intended dissolution or adjournment of the Council by the Pope, had caused the legates to send the Archbishop of Lanciano, Leonardo Marini, to Rome on June 8th, in order to obtain a verbal declaration of the Pope's intentions.[1] Shortly after the departure of Marini, Carlo Visconti, Bishop of Ventimiglia, arrived in Trent. The Pope had sent this able Milanese, who was related to, and a friend of Borromeo, in order that he might have a reliable and impartial agent at the Council; he was also to endeavour to bring about the restoration of unity among the legates.[2] Visconti devoted himself to this task with great zeal, and distinguished himself by his calm and tactful behaviour. On June 19th he had a long conversation with Gonzaga, in the course of which the latter spoke of the reports current as to his resignation as inventions. The legate at that time believed that he had dispelled the dissatisfaction of the Pope by the defence which he had made.[3] However, a letter from his nephew, Cardinal Francesco Gonzaga, of June 17th, which the legate, who was then staying at Pergine, received on the 23rd, informed him that Pius IV., once more roused by the complaints of Simonetta, had expressed his intention of replacing the president of the legatine college by another, should he continue to act as he had done hitherto.[4] Gonzaga was deeply humiliated by this, as well as by other matters,[5] and resolved himself to ask for his recall. He immediately sent his intimate friend, Francesco Arrivabene, to Rome for this purpose; the news caused great excitement and dismay in Trent.[6] In view of the position which Gonzaga held among the fathers of the Council and with the Catholic princes, his withdrawal would have entailed the most disastrous consequences for the progress of the deliberations of the Council.

---

[1] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 70-2; THEINER, II., 56 *seq.* *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 17, 11; KNÖPFLER, in the Freiburger Kirchenlex., XI^2., 2097 *seq.* In a letter to Borromeo of July 16, 1562, the legates speak at length of the reasons for the further postponement of the next session (the difficulty of treating of the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass; the proposal to come to a decision on the question of the chalice; and the desire of the fathers for some rest after their protracted labours during the dog days). ŠUSTA, II., 249.

---

[1] His instructions in Šusta, II., 184 *seqq.* *Cf.* Pallavicini, 17, 1, 7 and 2.

[2] See Šusta, II., viii, 455 *seq.*, 459 *seq.*, 489. *Cf.* Pallavicini, 17, 3; Ehses in the Hist. Jahrbuch, XXXVII., 52 *seq.*

[3] See Šusta, II., 208.

[4] See in Döllinger, Tagebücher, II., 37, the fragment of a letter of Fr. Gonzaga. Simonetta, on June 25, 1562, wrote explicitly to Borromeo that it was desirable to recall Gonzaga from the Council; see Šusta, II., 206.

[5] See Sickel, Konzil, 346.

[6] See Baluze-Mansi, IV., 241; Šusta, II., 209, 487 *seq.*

Pius IV., who was more cautious in deed than he was in his words, refused to accept Gonzaga's resignation, and commanded him to remain, and to continue to hold the presidentship of the legates.[1] The Archbishop of Lanciano who was sent back from Rome to Trent on July 1st, was the bearer of a letter to the Cardinal, in which the Pope's fullest confidence in him was expressed. Simonetta at the same time received instructions to show every consideration to Gonzaga, and keep on the best terms with him.[2] The complete reconciliation between the two legates only took place on July 19th, when Gonzaga was invited by Simonetta to dinner. The long explanations which were made on this occasion resulted in their mutual satisfaction and pleasure. Cardinal Gonzaga displayed real magnanimity, demanding no other punishment for the prelates who had fomented the strife, or who had offended him, than their improvement. When Borromeo wrote to him that the Pope was ready to remove the Bishop of La Cava, who had expressed himself in particularly disrespectful terms, from his position as Commissary of the Council, Gonzaga begged that he might be left at his post, where he was doing most useful work.[3]

No less important for the successful issue of the Council than the reconciliation of the two legates, to which Carlo

---

[1] *Cf.* Paleotto in THEINER, II., 567 *seq.;* report of Vargas of July 1, 1562, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 445 *seq.;* letter of Gonzaga to the Emperor on July 14, 1562, in SICKEL, Konzil, 354.

[2] See ŠUSTA, II., 227 *seq.*, 230. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 17, 5.

[3] See PALLAVICINI, 17, 13, 1. The Pope was engaged at that time, besides restoring concord among the legates, in settling disputes among the envoys as to precedence. In order to put an end to the quarrel between the Bavarian and Venetian envoys Pius IV. called for the help of the Emperor. The Bavarian envoy also demanded precedence over the Swiss and Florentine envoys. It was a matter of greater difficulty to settle the dispute about precedence between the representatives of Spain and France. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 17, 4; ŠUSTA, II., 237, 242 *seq.*, 249, 494 *seq.*

Visconti had materially contributed, was an intimation which reached Trent on July 18th. This came from Philip II. The courier who brought it had taken only eleven days to make the journey from Madrid to Trent, so as to arrive, if possible, before the Session, and to prevent an unseemly attitude on the part of the Spanish prelates. He delivered to the Marquis of Pescara a letter from the king, of July 6th, instructing him to inform the Spanish prelates that Philip II. did not wish any protest to be made in the matter of the duty of residence. and that, in consideration of the opposition of the Emperor and France, he did not insist on an explicit declaration of the continuation of the Council; it would be sufficient if it could be gathered from the proceedings themselves that this was a continuation of the former Council.[1] This decision on the part of Philip II. caused the greatest satisfaction in Rome, and on August 4th Borromeo gave instructions to Crivelli, the nuncio in Spain, to thank the king in the name of the Pope.[2]

On July 19th the legates submitted to the theologians thirteen articles relating to the holy sacrifice of the Mass.[3] A new regulation, drawn up on the 20th, had for its object to prevent the deliberations from being too protracted.[4] The discussion of the articles relating to the Mass required no less than thirteen meetings, which took place between July 21st and August 4th.[5] On August 6th the legates who were, at that time, highly delighted with the steps taken by Pius IV. for the reform of the Curia,[6] laid before the General Congregation the draft of a decree, in four chapters and twelve canons, on the essence, institution and fruits of the holy sacrifice of the Mass. The fathers of the Council discussed this from August 11th to the 27th, the theological question as to whether Christ had already offered Mass at the Last Supper especially giving rise to difficulties.[1]

---

[1] See SICKEL, Konzil, 352 *seq.*; MENDOÇA, 646-7; ŠUSTA, II., 261 *seq.*, 263 *seq.*, 276.

[2] ŠUSTA, II., 523 *seq.*

[3] See THEINER, II., 58; LE PLAT, V., 390 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 17, 13, 8.

[4] See THEINER, II., 58 *seq.*; RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 96; LE PLAT, V., 394-6.

[5] See THEINER, II., 60-73.

[6] See the letter of August 6, 1562, in ŠUSTA, II., 296. Concerning the progress of the reforms of Pius IV. *cf.* SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 128.

Ever since August 22nd the thorny question had been waiting for an answer, whether the chalice was to be granted or refused to the laity. Pius IV. had left the Council free to make the concession in a letter of July 18th; he thought it wiser, however, to defer the decision until the end of the Council.[2] Borromeo informed the legates on July 29th that the Pope desired that all possible satisfaction should be given to the Emperor in this matter, as far as was consistent with a good conscience and Christian charity. At the same time Gonzaga also received the intimation that Pius IV. approved his view that the decree as to the chalice should be formulated by the Council and not by the Pope.[3] The deliberations on this difficult question were taken in hand during the last week of August.[4]

Opinions as to the practical utility of granting the chalice to the laity differed very widely. Besides the impetuous and eloquent Bishop of Fünfkirchen,[5] Cardinal Madruzzo, Bishop Andreas Sbardalato of Knin, and Archbishop Marini of Lanciano were in favour of granting it. Among the opponents of the concession Castagna, Archbishop of Rossano, and Osio, Bishop of Rieti especially distinguished themselves by the learning and clearness of the arguments they adduced.

---

[1] See THEINER, II., 73-95; RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 97-100; LE PLAT, V., 428-31; MENDOÇA, 648; PALLAVICINI, 18, 1 and 2; ŠUSTA, II., 311-13, 338.

[2] ŠUSTA, II., 270 *seq.* *Cf.* STEINHERZ, III., 113.

[3] ŠUSTA, II., 289-91.

[4] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 73, 75-80; LE PLAT, V., 455 *seq.*, 463-88; THEINER, II, 96-116; Paleotto in THEINER, II., 579-87; MENDOÇA, 649 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 18, 3-5. *Cf.* also ŠUSTA, II., 542 *seq.*, 545 *seq.*, 550 *seq.*

[5] See LE PLAT, V., 459, 462. *Cf.* KASSOWITZ, XXV.

It was remarkable that the only German bishop who was present, Leonhard Haller, of Eichstätt, pronounced against the chalice for the laity; his colleague, Rettinger, Bishop of Lavant, had left Trent in order to avoid coming to a decision. All the opponents of the concession, however, insisted on the fact that it was in the power of the Church to allow the reception of Communion under both kinds. When Abbot Riccardo of Vercelli remarked that the request for the chalice had a taint of heresy, the presiding legate reproved him and bade him be silent.[1]

James Lainez, the General of the Jesuits, spoke on September 6th, as the last and most impressive of the speakers. He elucidated the whole question from every point of view, in an objective manner, treating it calmly, clearly, and with scholastic acumen. He expressly pointed out that it was merely a question of the practical appropriateness of the concession, and that neither the judgment of the Council nor the infallibility of the Pope were affected. His own view was that it was not salutary to allow the chalice to the laity, either generally or locally;[2] past experience had shown this, since, when the Council of Basle and Paul II. had allowed it, the apostasy from the Church had not only not been prevented, but even increased. Although the majority of the fathers agreed with Lainez, a middle course was eventually adopted, and the decision of the whole matter was left to the Pope.[3]

---

[1] See PALLAVICINI, 18, 4. *Cf.* EHSES in the Abhandlungen der Görres-Gesellschaft, Jahresbericht, 1917, p. 44 (Cologne, 1918).

[2] *Cf.* GRISAR, Lainez und die Frage des Laienkelches, in the Zeitschrift für kath. Theol., V. (1881) 672 *seqq.;* VI. (1882) 39 *seqq.;* Disput., II., 24 *seqq.* Grisar also gives particulars of the other activities of Lainez at Trent. The General of the Jesuits had arrived in the city of the Council on August 14; he showed the utmost modesty with regard to the place he was to occupy. See BONDONUS, 561 *seq.;* BOERO, Lainez, 254; CANISII Epist., III., 472, 531; ŠUSTA, II., 319, 334. All the discussions about the chalice for the laity from August 27 to September 6, 1562, with many of the original votes are in EHSES, VIII., 788-909.

[3] See the report of the legates of September 16, 1562, in ŠUSTA, II., 363.

When the remodelled decrees concerning the holy sacrifice of the Mass had been once more submitted to further discussion on September 5th and 7th,[1] a reform decree, and another concerning the abuses which had crept into the celebration of Mass, were presented for consideration on September 10th.[2] The discussions on these lasted from September 10th to the 14th.[3] In the General Congregation on September 16th, at which the decrees to be published on the following day were read aloud, very heated discussions took place concerning the institution of the priesthood.

The XXIInd Session, the sixth under Pius IV., was held on September 17th. The five legates, Cardinal Madruzzo, three patriarchs, twenty-two archbishops, a hundred and forty-four bishops, one Lateran abbot, seven generals of orders, three doctors of law, thirty theologians, and nine envoys were present. The Archbishop of Otranto, Pietro Antonio di Capua, celebrated High Mass, and the sermon was preached by Carlo Visconti, Bishop of Ventimiglia. The decree on the holy sacrifice of the Mass, in nine chapters and nine canons, the decree concerning the removal of abuses at Mass, the reform decree, in eleven chapters, and finally the above-mentioned decision concerning the chalice for the laity, were published at this Session.

The most important decree was that which, in answer to the numerous errors taught by the innovators, set forth the primitive Catholic doctrine of the Holy Mass. In this the following are laid down: at the Last Supper Jesus Christ bequeathed to his Church a sacrifice, by which the bloody sacrifice of the Cross was to be represented, its memory preserved, and the forgiveness of the sins which are daily committed by men applied. The Lord instituted this sacrifice when He offered His flesh and blood, under the appearances of bread and wine, to God the Father, giving it to the Apostles to eat, and thereby appointing them as His priests, commanding them and their successors to do this in memory of Him. In the sacrifice of the Mass, the same Christ who sacrificed Himself in a bloody manner, is offered up in an unbloody manner. The Mass is consequently a true expiatory sacrifice, by which the faithful gain the fruits of the sacrifice of the Cross, the value of which is not thereby prejudiced; Mass is therefore offered, not only for the living, but also for the souls still in Purgatory. When Mass is celebrated by the Church in honour of, and in memory of saints, she teaches that not to these, but to God alone is the sacrifice offered. From time immemorial the Church has ordained the Canon, which contains no error of any kind, for the worthy celebration of the Mass. She has, at the same time, in accordance with apostolic tradition, associated the offering of the sacrifice with ceremonies. It does not seem advisable to the Council that Mass should be universally celebrated in the language of the country. Finally, it repudiates all errors contrary to this teaching, and especially those directed against the sacrificial character of the Mass. The reform decree gives prescriptions for the worthy celebration of Mass, and admonishes the bishops to avoid anything having the appearance of avarice, or what is superstitious, or likely to give scandal.[1]

---

[1] See THEINER, II., 116-9. *Cf.* ŠUSTA, II., 339, 344.

[2] Two lists of these in EHSES, VIII., 916-24.

[3] See THEINER, II., 119-27.

Full unanimity was only obtained for the decree which fixed the next Session, for the treatment of the sacraments of Holy Orders and Matrimony, for November 12th.[3] Nobody dreamed that instead of the two months proposed, ten would elapse before another Session of the Council could be held.

---

[1] For the numerous abuses which, in the course of time had found their way into the Mass, see the classical work of A. Franz, Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter, Freiburg, 1902.

[2] *Cf.* Theiner, II., 130-2; Pallavicini, 18, 9. Concerning the satisfaction of Pius IV. at the result of the Session see Borromeo's letter of September 26, 1562, in Šusta, III., 12 *seq.*

CHAPTER IX.

THE MISSION OF MORONE TO FERDINAND I. AT INNSBRUCK, 1562-3.

AFTER Pius IV. had received the decrees of the sixth Session, he held congregations, at which reforms were discussed, almost every day.[1] The Council, on the other hand, entered upon the difficult discussions concerning the sacrament of Holy Orders. First of all, the legates submitted ten articles to the theologians for consideration on September 18th, 1562; these contained the views of the religious innovators upon the subject; the discussions were to begin on September 23rd.[2] Before that, however, the French and Imperial envoys, in accordance with an agreement brought about by the Bishop of Fünfkirchen, demanded that the further treatment of dogma should be postponed until the arrival of the French prelates, and only matters of reform dealt with in the next Session. This the legates refused,[3] and in the course of a very excited debate, the Bishop of Fünfkirchen and the French envoy demanded that the Imperial reform libellum should be laid before the Council. The legates refused to comply with this request as well. In the meantime, however, they had informed Borromeo, on September 24th, that they were inclined to submit the libellum, with the omission of all articles which encroached upon the authority of the Pope, or which, by their very nature, must be excluded; at the same time they asked for instructions as to how they were to proceed with regard to each separate article.[1] The detailed answer of the Pope on October 3rd, left the legates free to lay the libellum before the fathers of the Council, though this did not mean that they were to put the matter to the vote; at the same time they were to make known the Emperor's letter of June 29th, which left the legates free to select certain articles from the libellum for consideration.[2] Together with these instructions was also sent the Pope's opinion as to each of the articles;[3] this agreed, in all essentials, with the opinion sent to Rome by the legates on August 27th.[4] In spite of the support which he had received from France, Ferdinand I. did not continue, at that time, to press for the submission of his libellum, as other matters, and especially the difficulties about the election of his son, Maximilian, as King of the Romans, took up all his attention. It was only after this had been arranged (November 24th) that there came a change.[5]

---

[1] See SICKEL, Konzil, 390.

[2] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 89; LE PLAT, V., 508; THEINER, II., 133; PALLAVICINI, 18, 12, 1.

[3] *Cf.* MUSOTTI, 25 *seq.;* BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 72; SICKEL, Konzil, 387; STEINHERZ, III., 130; ŠUSTA, III., 5, 353 *seq.*, and especially HELLE, 37 *seq.*, where there is a further bibliography.

In the seven articles, which the theologians discussed from September 23rd to October 2nd,[6] the question whether the bishops' duty of residence was a divine or an ecclesiastical precept was not touched upon. However, the subject was soon broached once more by several, and especially by the theologian of the Archbishop of Granada. It came still more into prominence during the proceedings of the General Congregation between October 13th and 20th, which concerned the drafting of the doctrinal decree, and of the seven canons which pronounced an anathema in connection with the sacrament of Holy Orders. At the very beginning of the proceedings, on October 13th, the Archbishop of Granada made a formal proposal that it should be defined that the episcopal office rested on divine right.[1] The dispute which arose on this point, during which the position of the Pope, with reference to the whole Church, and also with reference to the Council, was debated, drove everything else into the background, and prevented the deliberations from making any progress.[2] Much learning and theological acumen was displayed on both sides during these stormy debates. The General of the Jesuits, James Lainez, who differed from most of his Spanish compatriots on this point, distinguished himself above all the rest. The speech which he made on October 20th, before the taking of the vote, was a masterpiece, distinguished alike by its vast learning, its clearness, and its pertinency.[3] It created an impression such as was scarcely made by any other address during the whole course of the Council.[4] Many, even of his opponents, were convinced by the force of the arguments brought forward by Lainez, while others allowed themselves to be drawn into making violent, and even personal attacks upon him.[1]

---

[1] See Grisar, Disput., I., 391 *seq.;* Šusta, III., 8; Steinherz, III., 133.

[2] Sickel, Berichte, II., 125-33. *Cf.* Steinherz, III., 133; Šusta, III., 20.

[3] Printed in Raynaldus, 1562, n. 59, 63; Le Plat, V., 388. *Cf.* Steinherz, III., 133, n. 4. A second appendix, in which Pius IV. takes up a position against the reform decrees decided upon by the French clergy at Poissy on October 6, 1561, was published by Šusta (III., 20 *seq.*), who found it among the literary remains of Seripando.

[4] Partly in Raynaldus, 1562, n. 62, 58; Le Plat, V., 385-8. The first part, hitherto unpublished, in Steinherz, III., 132 *seq.*

[5] *Cf.* Helle, 40, 41.

[6] See Theiner, II., 135-51; Paleotto in Theiner, II., 591 *seq.;* Raynaldus, 1562, n. 90-2; Le Plat, V., 510-6.

---

[1] See THEINER, II., 153 *seq.;* Paleotto in THEINER, II., 593 *seq.;* PALLAVICINI, 18, 12 and 14; GRISAR, Primat, 463 *seq.;* Disput, I., 34**seq.*, II., 410 *seq.;* ŠUSTA, III., 23 *seq.*, 384, 391 *seq.*

[2] EHSES has published in the Hist. Jahrbuch, XXXVII., 72 *seq.*, the strong letter in which, as early as June 13, 1562, Morone rebuked his nephew, Girolamo Gallarate, Bishop of Sutri-Nepi, for his declaration in favour of the definition of the *ius divinum*, by which the whole activity of the Council would have been paralysed.

[3] Lainez wrote out his speech. It is preserved in the Papal Secret Archives, *Concilio, V., 98 *seq.*, but is not yet printed. PALLAVICINI (18, 15) knew of the manuscript, but it was overlooked by GRISAR (Primat, 460). Theiner has abridged the reports at this point. See ASTRAIN, II., 180.

[4] The opinion of SARPI (7, 20).

In view of the great differences of opinion, it was exceedingly difficult to find any other version of the matter to be brought forward for discussion, especially in the case of the seventh canon, which dealt with the episcopal power. Further discussions followed from November 3rd, to the 6th, during the course of which several Italian bishops, who had their own advantage in view rather than the real interests of the Church, went much too far in their defence of the Papal rights.[2]

Pius IV. had in the meantime resolved to cope with one of the things most urgently necessary for the reform of the Church, by a bull concerning the conclave, which was dated October 9th. In sending this to the legates on October 31st, he held out hopes of still further measures for the reform of the Curia.[3] On November 6th, Cardinal Gonzaga submitted the draft of a decree, approved by the Pope, concerning the duty of residence.[4] Three days later, on his proposal, the first postponement of the Session, from November 12th to the 26th, was made, because the material was not ready for publication, and also because the long awaited arrival of the Cardinal of Lorraine and other French prelates was expected immediately.[5] In fact, Cardinal Guise arrived on November

---

[1] *Cf.* the report of Visconti of October 22, 1562, in GRISAR, Primat, 492, Disput., I., 43*, 45*, and Paleotto in THEINER, II., 596. See also Epist. Salmeronis, I., 508; BARTOLI, Comp. di Gesù (Opere, V., 2), 74, 87; BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 75.

[2] See THEINER, II., 155-61; Paleotto in THEINER, II., 599 *seq.*; GRISAR, Primat, 469 *seq.*

[3] ŠUSTA, III., 55 *seq.* The bull *Super reformatione conclavis* in RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 188. As to this and its great importance *cf.* especially SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 131 *seq.*; EISLER, Vetorecht, 191 *seq.* Fr. Tonina reported on October 21, 1562: *Si attende qui a formar riforme et si fanno spesso congregationi sopra di ciò (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[4] THEINER, II, 161-3; RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 108; LE PLAT, V., 541.

[5] THEINER, II., 167 *seq.*; RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 117; LE PLAT, V., 542; ŠUSTA, III., 65, 429 *seq.*

13th, and with him thirteen bishops, three abbots, and eighteen theologians, for the most part doctors of the Sorbonne; among the bishops were Nicolas de Pellevé of Sens, Jean Morvillier of Orleans, and Nicolas Pseaume of Verdun;[1] till then there had only been five French bishops at Trent. The newly arrived dignitaries of France were solemnly introduced in the General Congregation of November 23rd. On this occasion Guise made a speech which was universally admired on account of the elegance of its style and the dignity of its delivery. He exhorted the fathers of the Council to refrain from all useless disputes, and to carry out the reform of the Church.[2] The frank recognition of the Pope's supremacy with which he concluded, was calculated to remove the suspicion felt in Rome, on account of the attitude which he had taken up with regard to the rights of the Holy See.[3]

The Cardinal of Lorraine had hoped to be included among the presidents of the Council, but this hope was not fulfilled. However, from the beginning he occupied a far more important position than Cardinal Madruzzo, who also did not belong to the legatine college. It is significant of this that in the Papal secretariate the correspondence with him is drawn up in legal style, just as was done when issuing instructions to the legates.[1] All parties at Trent endeavoured to win over the French Cardinal to their way of thinking, and the latter soon found himself drawn into both open and secret negotiations with men of opposite views. Charles de Guise endeavoured, with the best will and the most persevering courage, above everything else to bring about an agreement of the opposing parties concerning the question of residence, and the much disputed seventh canon. Until the following year the discussions upon the proposals put forward for treatment concentrated more and more, with unending repetitions and often in very heated debates, upon these questions,[2] the defenders of the divine right of the bishops often laying themselves open to the charge of holding very dangerous opinions. For example, Danes, Bishop of Lavaur, in France, maintained that Peter had not been universal bishop of the Church, that the authority of his successors over the bishops was only an accessory, and that the bishops not only held their power by divine right, but also that in their own churches they were equal to the Pope ![3]

---

[1] *Cf.* BONDONUS, 562 *seq.*; BALUZE-MANSI, IV., 271; THEINER, II., 169 *seqq.*; LE PLAT, VII., 343; ŠUSTA, III., 66 *seq.*; KASSOWITZ, xxvii *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 18, 17; BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 329 *seq.* Guise took up his residence in the Palazzo a Prato in the Contrada S. Trinità (destroyed in great part in the fire of 1843); see SWOBODA, 23. Pseaume is the author of the diary on the Council, critically edited for the first time by MERKLE (II., 723 *seqq.*).

[2] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 109-15; LE PLAT, V., 549-63; THEINER, II., 175 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 18, 7 and 19, 3; Arch. stor. Ital., 5th Series, XXXVI., 417; BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 334 *seq.*; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 129 *seq.* The envoy of Sigismund Augustus, King of Poland, Bishop Valentin Herborth of Przemysl, was received in the General Congregation of October 23 (see RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 106-7; LE PLAT, V., 532-7; THEINER, II., 154; ŠUSTA, III., 36, 391, 397). Cardinal Altemps had gone at the end of October to Constance (see PALLAVICINI, 18, 16).

[3] To the testimony already cited (*cf.* DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 349; ŠUSTA, III., 62) must be added a *letter of Tonina, dated Rome, October 21, 1562 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

It is not to be wondered at that the development of affairs in Trent was watched with increasing anxiety in Rome.[4] The discussions, which were as tedious as they were dangerous, might have been avoided altogether if the fathers of the Council had paid attention to the fundamental distinction which Charles Borromeo had drawn in one short sentence of the letter which he addressed to the legates on October 29th.

---

[1] *Cf.* SICKEL, Berichte, I., 60 ; III., 14, 42 ; ŠUSTA, III., v-vi.

[2] " Este capitulo de la residencia y el septimo canon," writes Mendoça (p. 668), " han sido los dos mayores estorbos que han tenido las cosas del concilio, para dilatarse mas de lo que era menester y mas de lo que muchos querian." For the disgraceful scene at the speeches of the Bishops of Cadiz and Alife on December 1 and 2, 1562, see PALLAVICINI, 19, 5.

[3] See THEINER, II., 172-3 ; GRISAR, Primat, 480.

[4] *Cf.* the pessimistic expressions of GIROLAMO SORANZO, 82.

The distinction between the power of "order" (consecration) and of jurisdiction, is here clearly pointed out. Bishops have the former in virtue of their consecration, directly from God, and the visible minister of the consecration, be he Pope or bishop, when he confers it, is only acting as an instrument, so that the invisible and immediate giver of the consecration may fulfil His supernatural work. On the other hand, the jurisdiction of the bishops, that is to say their position with regard to their flock, and their authority to rule over them in matters concerning their eternal salvation, although it too is derived from God, is directly communicated to the bishops, according to the teaching of the scholastics, by the Pope alone.[1]

James Lainez, who had maintained this opinion in his first speech on October 20th, in his second address on December 9th, made a proposal that was as practical as it was moderate; this was that the "order" of the bishops should be defined as being of divine right, and that no mention should be made of jurisdiction, since both opinions had many supporters.[2] Attention was diverted from this proposal by two further formulas, which Cardinal Guise, who was working unweariedly for an agreement, put forward, amplifying the seventh canon by an eighth one, concerning the primacy. On the suggestion of Cardinal Simonetta, who was always solicitous for the rights of the Holy See, a commission was appointed to deliberate on this, consisting of four theologians (one of whom was Lainez) and five canonists. Three of the theologians spoke in favour of the proposal, but not so the General of the Jesuits, who remarked that he saw in it a future schism. The five canonists, among whom were two future Popes, Ugo Boncompagni and Giovanni Antonio Fachinetti, agreed with Lainez.[3] The legates, whose position was daily becoming more difficult, sent the proposal of Guise, together with the report of the commission, to Rome. Borromeo sent three answers, the first on December 12th, a second, in greater detail, on December 26th, 1562, and finally, a third on January 10th, 1563. These contained among other things, the instruction that, in order to secure the necessary clearness, the definition of the Council of Florence as to the primacy, should be renewed.[1]

---

[1] See GRISAR, Primat, 457 *seq.* The letter of Borromeo is now given in full in ŠUSTA, III., 50 *seq.*

[2] See THEINER, II., 197 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 19, 6, 5; GRISAR, Primat, 491, 759 *seq.*; *cf.* Disput., I., 1 *seq.*

[3] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 19, 6, 5; GRISAR, Primat, 760 *seq.*

How necessary it was that renewed prominence should be given, just at that time, to the authority of the Holy See, and its inalienable rights, assailed as they were, and not by the Protestants alone, was shown by the discussion which followed, during the course of which the Gallican current in the Council appeared clearly on the surface. The French prelates refused, in the most violent manner, to acknowledge that the bishops held a position dependent on the Pope, nor would they allow it to be stated in the seventh canon that the Pope had the power to govern the Church, as that would prejudice the view which placed the Council above the Pope.[2]

On January 24th, 1563, the French envoys, Lansac and Ferrier, appeared before the legates and protested against the words "the Pope governs the Church." They wished, they expressly stated, to stand up for "their religion," which taught that the Pope is subject to the Council, and in proof of this they appealed to the Council of Constance. The answer of the legates left nothing to be desired in the way of firmness. Cardinal Gonzaga replied that if the envoys thought of defending the opinion they submitted, he and other legates were equally determined to defend the truth, and this truth was that the Pope was above the Council; they were ready to sacrifice their lives before they would allow the supremacy of the Pope to be inpugned. Seripando then invalidated their appeal to the Council of Constance by saying that the latter had, for the removal of the schism, claimed superiority only over doubtful Popes, of which at the present time there could be no question. He concluded with the declaration that the legates were fully determined that the supreme authority of the Pope should be defined and published in suitable terms, and in the widest signification of the word.[1]

---

[1] Borromeo's instructions, only summarized by Pallavicini, of December 12 and 26, 1562, and January 10, 1563, have been given in a translation by GRISAR, Primat, 762 *seq.*, and afterwards in the original in Disput., I., 455 *seq.*, 457 *seq.*, 461 *seq.*, 467 *seq.* *Cf.* ŠUSTA, III., 116, 141 and 153, where, in addition to several textual corrections from the original (Ambrosiana Library, Milan, J. 141, inf. p.167) the date of the last instruction is corrected.

[2] See Paleotto in THEINER, II., 614; GRISAR, Primat, 768 *seq.*

Cardinal Guise would have been very glad if the dispute concerning the Pope's supremacy could have been avoided. His depression of spirits increased from day to day. On January 18th, 1563, a commission had been appointed under the presidency of himself and Cardinal Madruzzo; it formulated a new decree on the duty of residence,[2] but this was neither approved by the legates, nor placed by them upon the agenda.[3] The Session, which had been first fixed for December 17th, 1562, then for the beginning of January, 1563, and finally for January 15th, had in the meantime been postponed till February 4th.[4] As no agreement could be come to, however, the Session could not be held on that date. Therefore, on February 3rd, Cardinal Gonzaga proposed a further postponement for a longer period, until April 22nd, to put aside, for the time being, the difficult questions of the duty of residence and of Holy Orders, and in the meantime to deal with the sacrament of Matrimony. Discussions were to take place twice every day; in the mornings on Matrimony, by the theologians, and in the afternoons, on the abuses connected with the ordination of priests, by the bishops. Of the 176 fathers of the Council present, only nine voted against this proposal.[1] Accordingly, on the same day, eight articles on the sacrament of Matrimony were submitted to the theologians, as fresh matter for deliberation, and these were discussed from February 9th onwards.[2] On February 12th steps were taken to form a commission of ten prelates, who were to compile a list of the abuses in the ordination of priests.[3]

---

[1] See Paleotto, *loc. cit.*; the letter of the legates of January 24, in GRISAR, Disput., I., 486-92. *Cf.* GRISAR, Primat., 769 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, III., 181. See also PALLAVICINI, 19, 14.

[2] No agreement was reached upon the theme proposed on December 10, 1562; see THEINER, II., 198.

[3] See THEINER, II., 229 *seq.*; KNÖPFLER in the Freiburger Kirchenlex., XI², 2102.

[4] See THEINER, II., 179, 186 *seq.*, 206 *seq.*, 218 *seq.*, 228 *seq.*

To all these difficulties a new one was now added by the fact that the French, in conjunction with the Imperialists, endeavoured to force the Pope to accept a reform at the hands of the Council. On January 3rd the French envoys had presented to the General Congregation a reform libellum in thirty-four points. It was expressed, indeed, in terms of moderation, but it contained claims which were either impracticable or dangerous, as for example the one concerning the concession of the chalice to the laity.[4] Lansac then declared that if the Council would not grant these claims, France would introduce them on her own authority.[5] In the General Congregation on February 11th, the French envoys, following upon the receipt of a letter from their king, and supported by Guise, again put forward their demands for reform.[6]

These proceedings of the French caused the Emperor, whose activities had hitherto been paralysed by other cares, once more, on the advice of his chancellor, Seld, to intervene in the conciliar discussions. He gave instructions to his envoys at Trent to support the reform proposals of the French, and to insist upon the discussion of the libellum which he had presented in June, 1562. In order to be nearer to the Council, he removed his court to Innsbruck in January, 1563, and, for the purpose of discussing the questions then pending, he summoned thither a meeting of distinguished theologians,[1] which might be looked upon as a kind of Imperial bye-council.

---

[1] See RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 17; LE PLAT, V., 672; THEINER, II., 230-2; PALLAVICINI, 19, 16.

[2] See RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 19; LE PLAT, V., 674; THEINER, II., 232 *seqq.*; ŠUSTA, III., 212.

[3] See MUSOTTI, 33.

[4] See RAYNALDUS, 1562, n. 86-9; LE PLAT, V., 629-43; PALLAVICINI, 19, 11; BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 338 *seq.*

[5] So reported Strozzi on January 4, 1563; see ŠUSTA, III., 154.

[6] See RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 23-6; LE PLAT, V., 677-84; THEINER II., 235 *seq.* See BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 343 *seq.*

On February 12th, the ambitious Cardinal Guise betook himself from Trent to Innsbruck, where Cardinal Madruzzo and the Count of Luna, the envoy of Philip II., were also expected. Guise, who arrived at Innsbruck on February 16th, immediately expressed himself in the strongest terms against the advisers of the Pope, and declared that a reform by means of the Council was indispensable. In a memorial which he handed to the Emperor, he set forth all the many abuses which he said encroached upon the freedom of the Council, namely, the preponderant influence of the Pope, the domination of the Council by the Italian bishops, who formed a majority, the exclusive right of making proposals by the legates, and the appointment of only one secretary of the Council, whose truthfulness, he averred, was open to grave suspicion. It was therefore desirable that as many bishops as possible should come from Spain, France and Germany, and also that the Emperor should himself go to Trent and be present at the next Session.[2] To the Spanish and French opposition, which had made itself felt at the Council in the discussion of questions of dogma, the time had come to add a coalition of the great Catholic powers, the Emperor, France and Spain, aiming at domination of the Council, and the enforcement of a drastic reform both of head and members. The situation had, without doubt, become extremely critical.

The legates had sent Commendone to Innsbruck to pacify the Emperor as early as the end of January,[1] although it was hardly to be hoped that this mission would meet with any decisive success. Pius IV., who was going on with his work of reform, certainly did not himself expect that he would be able thus to silence the petulant demands of the powers. On the strength of previous experience, he suddenly proposed to try the effect of the intervention of a distinguished ecclesiastical dignitary, who should possess the respect and confidence of the Emperor.[2] On February 10th he urgently begged Cardinal Gonzaga to go as soon as possible to Innsbruck.[3] The president of the legates at Trent seemed, in virtue of his family relationship with Ferdinand, and his tact and skill, admirably suited to influence the Emperor and to demonstrate to him the readiness of Pius IV. to carry out a decisive reform. Gonzaga, however, declined in a letter of February 19th. This refusal was probably to be accounted for by the complete failure of the mission of Commendone, as well as the failing health of the Cardinal himself.[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* Sickel, Konzil, 419 *seq.*, 431 *seq.;* Steinherz, III., 171 *seq.;* Kassowitz, 158 *seq.;* Ritter, I., 168 *seq.*

[2] See Sickel, Konzil, 433 *seq.;* Steinherz, III., 195 *seq.*, 212 *seq.* For the motives which determined Guise to make his journey to Innsbruck, and his negotiations there, *cf.*alsoVenezian. Depeschen, III., 220 *seqq.;* Zeitschr. für Kirchengeschicte,I., 323; Docum, inéd., XCVIII., 403, 407; Holtzmann, Maximilian II., 441 *seq.;* Šusta, III., 252.

When Guise returned to Trent on February 27th, he found the first president of the Council already very ill. A fever which he had contracted on February 23rd rapidly wasted the strength of the fifty-eight-year-old Cardinal, already worn out by the exertions and anxieties of the Council. On the evening of March 2nd, this distinguished ecclesiastic, who had worn the purple for thirty-six years, and for whom many had prophesied the tiara,[5] breathed forth his noble soul. The last sacraments were administered to him by the General of the Jesuits, who had returned a short time before from Mantua, whither the Cardinal had sent him to found a college of the Society of Jesus.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 20, 1; POGIANI Epist., III., 242 n.; STEINHERZ, III., 180 *seq.*, 182 *seq.*, 185 *seq.*, 191 *seq.*, 198 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, III., 173, 183 *seq.*, 208, 232 *seq.* The instruction for Commendone dated January 28, 1563, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, III., 316 *seq.*

[2] See RITTER, I., 171; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 141 *seq.*

[3] See ŠUSTA, III., 224 *seq.*

[4] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 20, 6, 4; ŠUSTA, III., 229.

[5] See the interesting **report of Fr. Tonina dated Rome, January 23, 1563 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

In the Congregation of March 8th, Seripando, too, was attacked by a dangerous illness, which caused his death on the 17th. The celebrated General of the Augustinians died as piously as he had lived. He insisted on receiving the last sacraments fully dressed and on his knees. As certain views which he had formerly advanced, concerning original sin and justification, had shaken the confidence of many persons in the perfect purity of his faith, the dying man took the occasion to recite one by one, in the presence of the most distinguished theologians, the articles of the Creed, and to swear that he had believed them all without the least doubt.[2]

More than any of the members of the Council to deplore the loss of their colleagues, who had been distinguished by such splendid qualities, were the two surviving legates, Hosius and Simonetta. They felt the responsibility which was now laid upon their shoulders all the more heavily as the differences of opinion regarding the relations between the primacy and the episcopate, and about the duty of residence, continued with undiminished force, while the demands for reform on the part of the French and the Emperor were daily growing more urgent. In addition to all these difficulties there now came the want of money caused by the death of Gonzaga,[3] and the outbreak of bloody combats among the retainers of the French, Spanish and Italian prelates, in consequence of which the holding of Congregations was altogether prevented from March 9th to the 15th.[4]

---

[1] *Cf.* BONDONUS, 565; MENDOÇA, 672; POGIANI Epist., III., 258; PALLAVICINI, 20, 6, 1-3; SICKEL, Konzil, 439; Beiträge, I., 52; GIULIANI, 119; ŠUSTA, III., 253 *seq.*, 257 *seq.*; ASTRAIN, II., 187 *seq.*

[2] See BONDONUS, 565-6; MENDOÇA, 674; PALLAVICINI, 20, 7, 6-8; Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. V., 615 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, III., 263 *seq.*, 277; MERKLE, II., lxxi *seq.*, where there are details as to the tomb and will of the Cardinal.

[3] See ŠUSTA, III., 282 *seq.*

[4] *Cf.* THEINER, II., 256; BONDONUS, 56, MENDOÇA, 673 *seq.*; SICKEL, Konzil, 468.

In the meantime the Emperor, whose theological commission at Innsbruck was engaged upon the drafting of a new, the second, reform libellum,[1] addressed two letters to the Pope on March 3rd, which caused great anxiety in the Curia.[2] One of these letters,[3] which was also communicated to the Imperial envoys at Trent, to the legates, to Cardinal Guise, and to others, demanded reform in general terms. It expressed the regret of the Emperor at the unsatisfactory course of events at the Council, and at the reports which were current that the Pope intended either to suspend or dissolve it, which would cause great harm to the Church. He hoped that the Council might soon be brought to a successful close, and the longed-for reform carried into effect. For this, however, full liberty was necessary, and therefore the right of proposition must not be reserved to the legates alone, but must also be granted to the envoys of the princes. Finally, the Emperor announced his inclination to appear at the Council himself, and addressed an urgent request to the Pope to do likewise. The second, confidential, letter,[4] contained the same exhortations and demands, but was expressed in a less severe form. In this the Emperor especially demanded that for the future simony, and all other unworthy influence should be excluded from the Papal election, that no Cardinal should be appointed who, on account of his youth or want of learning, was unfit to hold the position,[5] and finally that the existing abuses in the election of archbishops and bishops by the cathedral chapters should be abolished.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* STEINHERZ, III., 209 *seqq.*; KRÖSS, 621 *seq.*; KASSOWITZ, 180 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 455; *ibid.*, 452 *seq.* Arco's report of the declaration made by Pius IV. after the receipt of the Imperial letter.

[3] See RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 34 LE PLAT, V., 690. *Cf.* KRÖSS, 625 *seq.*; STEINHERZ, III., 234 *seq.*

[4] Complete in STEINHERZ, III., 223 *seq.*

[5] This claim was founded on the creation of Cardinals of January 6, 1563, so widely and justly found fault with, in which Federigo Borromeo and Ferdinando de' Medici received the purple, the one being eighteen years of age, and the other hardly fourteen. The nomination of Federigo was a compliment to the first president of the Council, and that of Ferdinand to Cosimo I. Pius IV., who

Towards the end of 1562, Pius IV. would have been very willing to suspend the Council,[2] on the proposal of the Em-

---

did not, while the Council was sitting, feel safe in the States of the Church, thought it well to seize upon every opportunity of placing at least the Italian princes under an obligation to himself (see STEINHERZ, III., 178 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, III., 157 *seq.*, 161, 193 *seq.*). For the creation of January 6, 1563, see PETRAMELLARIUS, 73 *seq.*; CIACONIUS, III., 943 *seq.*; CARDELLA, V., 53 *seq.*; HERRE, 68). The appearance of Cardinal Ferdinando is well described by the author of an account of a journey of Duke Ferdinand, third son of Duke Albert V. of Bavaria, in the year 1565, printed in FREYBERG, Sammlung historischer Schriften, IV., 317 *seq.*, Stuttgart, 1834. As early as January 30, 1563, Tonina *reports that people were speaking of a fresh creation of Cardinals (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[1] On the same March 3, 1563, the Emperor addressed a letter to Guise (LE PLAT, V., 690 *seq.*), and a fresh instruction to his envoys at Trent, printed in SICKEL, Konzil, 446 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 456 *seq.*, and 463 *seq.*, the further instructions of March 21 and 23, 1563. *Cf.* as to this HELLE, 42 *seq.*

[2] Before the arrival of Guise they were prepared for the Cardinal to propose the removal of the Council to Besançon or Constance; the Cardinal himself had spoken of this to the nuncio, Santa Croce (see the report of Santa Croce of June 26, 1562, in ŠUSTA, II., 492). On the strength of this, on July 8, 1562, Borromeo sent instructions to the legates to hurry on the work of the Council as much as possible (*ibid.*, II., 239 *seqq.*). On July 18 Borromeo wrote to Delfino, who had (June 29) made the proposal that the Council should be suspended: "If the Emperor, in agreement with Philip II. makes a proposal for the suspension of the Council, the Pope is inclined to accept it." (STEINHERZ, III., 94 *seqq.*). On July 22 Borromeo again wrote to Delfino that the Pope was agreeable to a conference on religion, the Council being first suspended or closed, but that the Emperor must win over the King of Spain to this plan (*ibid.*, 100). On August 8 the legates received orders from Borromeo to bring the Council to a close with all possible speed, and the same order was repeated on August 22 (see ŠUSTA, II., 308, 325 *seq.*). Pius IV. himself wrote to the legates in the same sense on August 26 (ŠUSTA, II., 327 *seq.*).

peror; on November 14th, 1562, as Borromeo had written to Delfino, the Pope expected such a proposal from Ferdinand I. Pius IV. did not wish to take the initiative himself, and at the end of November he declined Delfino's plan of writing to Philip II. to close the Council. On December 20th Borromeo wrote to Delfino that if a proposal for suspension were not made by the Imperial Court, the Council would continue its sessions, for the Pope would not come forward with such a proposal himself.[1] As time went on however, Pius IV. became more and more convinced of the grave objections which stood in the way of a suspension or a premature closing of the Council. On the other hand it became equally clear to him that the useful progress and the successful issue to the work of the Council depended upon an understanding with the secular princes, and especially with the Emperor. He called upon the latter, in a brief of March 6th, 1563, to undertake the defence of the Apostolic See against all attacks in the Council, and to instruct his envoys to act in union with the legates. The brief, at the same time, laid stress on the sincere wish and the zealous endeavours of the Pope to do away with all abuses, and to introduce a strict reform.[2]

On March 18th two briefs were drawn up in answer to the Imperial letters of March 3rd. In the first, the Pope praised the Emperor's zeal, and regretted with him the slow progress of the Council, and the want of unity there; in answer to the rumours of suspension or dissolution, he declared his fixed intention of continuing the Council, and of bringing it to a happy conclusion. He then spoke of what he had already done in the way of reform, and finally explained his reasons for not going in person to Trent.[3] A confidential letter was also drawn up in answer to the confidential letter of Ferdinand I. In this the Pope said that the Emperor was perfectly right in maintaining that it was of the utmost importance for Christendom that the Papal election should be lawful and beyond reproach. So many good and wise laws had already been issued on this matter by former Councils and Popes, that it had been believed that nothing more could be added. In order, however, completely to remove every abuse, the Pope had published a new law. He had not communicated it to the Council before its publication, much as he would have liked to do so, because he had realized, since the recent disputes, how difficult it was, in such an important and controverted manner, to succeed in accomplishing anything. Should the Council, however, of its own accord, approve the law which he had issued, it would be very pleasing to him. With regard to the nomination of Cardinals, he referred to the statements which would be made by Cardinal Morone, who had been decided upon as legate at the Imperial court.[1]

---

[1] STEINHERZ, III., 144, 151, 163.

[2] RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 67; LE PLAT, V., 709 *seq.*; STEINHERZ, III., 237 *seq.* The reply of Ferdinand I. on March 23, in SICKEL, Konzil, 468 *seq.*

[3] See RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 35; LE PLAT, V., 761-5.

The dispatch of these briefs, however, did not take place, because it was decided that all the matters touched upon in the Imperial letters of March 3rd should be answered verbally by Morone. His mission was announced to the Emperor by the legate in a detailed brief on March 19th.[2] The other very important task with which Morone had already been entrusted, his appointment as legate to the Council, was also spoken of in this brief.

When the news of Gonzaga's death reached Rome on March 6th, Pius IV. at once saw that he must provide a successor for the dead president without delay. On the very next morning, without consulting the Sacred College, he appointed Morone and Navagero as legates to the Council.[3] By this act, so quickly carried out, Pius IV. again displayed his great political shrewdness. Other proposals were made, especially the candidature of the ambitious Cardinal Guise, which was at once put forward. Although he had kept his intention secret, Cardinal Bourdaisière had succeeded in gaining admission to the Pope before the consistory of March 7th, to represent to him the necessity of appointing Guise. Pius IV. answered him shortly and decidedly that as the Cardinal of Lorraine was looked upon as the head of a party in the Council, it was impossible to consider it advisable to make him a president, since not the least suspicion of partiality must attach to the holder of such a dignity.[1]

---

[1] See RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 38; LE PLAT, V., 765-8; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 143 *seq.*

[2] See STEINHERZ, III., 259. *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 471.

[3] See Acta consist. card. Gambarae (Cod. Vat. 7061) in SICKEL, Beiträge, I., 52; ŠUSTA, 267 *seq.*, 270; POGIANI Epist., III., 262; DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 487; SICKEL, Konzil, 452.

Pius IV. had shown great wisdom in his choice of the new legates to the Council. Of the three who were still at Trent, two, Hosius and Seripando, were theologians, while Simonetta was a canonist. As the necessity of a good understanding with the great powers, for the progress and conclusion of the Council, had been growing more and more evident since the arrival of the French, there was urgent need of skilled diplomatists. From this point of view, among all the Cardinals, Morone and Navagero seemed the most suitable. Navagero had had a splendid career as Venetian ambassador, while Morone was certainly the most able diplomatist who was at that time at the disposal of the Holy See. In addition to this, Morone had been for many years, and in quite a special way, entrusted with ecclesiastical affairs, for which reason Paul III. had destined him for the office of legate at the first announcement of the Council of Trent. He had enjoyed the friendship of Pius IV. for many years, and possessed his confidence in the highest degree. Morone was also, with the exception of Borromeo, more closely acquainted with the progress of the Council up till now than any other member of the Sacred College, and in addition to all this he possessed, in a high degree, the respect and confidence of the Emperor.[2]

On March 24th, 1563, Morone left the Eternal City, and on

---

[1] See Pallavicini, 20, 6, 4-5; Le Plat, V., 713; Baguenault de Puchesse, 346; Šusta, III., 270.

[2] See Pallavicini, *loc. cit.*; Sickel, Beiträge, I., 57 *seq.*; Ehses in the Histor. Jahrbuch, XXXVII., 57 *seq.*

April 10th, the vigil of Easter, he arrived in Trent.[1] At that time the work of the Council was almost at a standstill. The joy that was felt at the arrival of the new legate was increased when the new envoy of the King of Spain, the Count di Luna, appointed to succeed Pescara, arrived quite unexpectedly on April 12th.[2]

The importance and ability of Morone at once became apparent in the negotiations upon which he entered with the envoys of the powers who were at Trent, and with Guise and other distinguished persons, scarcely any of whom believed in the Pope's real desire for reform.[3] These negotiations, however, could only be provisional, as everything depended on the attitude of the Emperor. After Morone had entered upon his new office at the General Congregation of April 13th,[4] he set out at once for the Imperial court on April 16th. After a journey which was rendered very difficult by the cold and rainy weather, he reached Innsbruck on April 21st. The Emperor had been awaiting his arrival with impatience; he went to meet the Pope's representative some distance beyond the gates of the city, and accompanied him in his entry.[5]

Negotiations were commenced on the following day. In a conversation which lasted for four hours, Morone gave to the Emperor answers on all the points contained in his two letters of March 3rd. The slow progress of affairs at the Council was discussed in detail, as were the true causes of the evil and the means of obviating it, together with the question of the suspension, the liberty of the Council and the asking for instructions from Rome, the right of proposition by the legates, the reform of the head of the Church, the Papal election, the nomination of Cardinals, the election of bishops and their duty of residence, the reasons why the Pope could not go to Trent, and the invitation sent to Ferdinand I. to receive the Imperial crown at Bologna. On all these points Morone kept to the statements made in the briefs of March 18th,[1] which had not been sent; he endeavoured, with great skill, and to the best of his ability, to justify them, but, as he reported to Rome on April 23rd, he met with serious difficulties on several important points. The Emperor entertained, as the legate clearly saw, the best intentions towards the Church and the Pope, but the situation was made difficult by the previous agreement which he had made with France and Spain. Ferdinand especially insisted on the right of proposition for the envoys, on the limitation of Roman dispensations, and on the reform of the composition of the German cathedral chapters. He did not absolutely refuse to make the journey to Bologna for his coronation, which the Pope desired, while Morone's declaration of the burning zeal of Pius IV. for reform, made a visible impression on him.[2] The two guiding principles which the distinguished legate kept before him were to make every possible concession to the Emperor, and at the same time to adhere firmly to the inalienable rights of the Holy See.[3]

---

[1] See BONDONUS, 567; *ibid.* 568, for the arrival of Cardinal Navagero, which only took place on April 28. For the departure of Morone and his letter of credential, see STEINHERZ, III., 277-8; for the course of his journey see ŠUSTA, III., 287. The autograph letter of Pius IV. to the Emperor, dated March 25, 1563, which was sent after the legate, in RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 60; LE PLAT, V., 774 *seq.*

[2] See BONDONUS, 567.

[3] PALLAVICINI, 20, 11 and 12. *Cf.* the *Relatione* in the Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., III., 654 *seq.*

[4] See RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 63 *seq.*; THEINER, II., 262 *seq.*

[5] See STEINHERZ, III., 278.

---

[1] *Cf. supra* p. 314.

[2] See Morone's report to Borromeo of April 23, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 266 *seq.*; *ibid.*, 270 *seq.*, also the *Sommario della risposta data dal card. Morone all' imperatore.* If the *Sommario* is compared with the drafts of the briefs of March 18 (see *supra* p. 314) it is evident, as STEINHERZ (p. 277) justly points out, that the latter served in the place of a true and proper instruction. Whether a written instruction was ever given, as might be supposed from PALLAVICINI, 20, 13, 4, must be left uncertain; it has not so far been found.

[3] See Morone's final report of May 17, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 311.

Morone wished to treat with the Emperor by word of mouth alone, and in secret, without witnesses or intermediaries. This easily understood wish, however, could not be strictly adhered to. Ferdinand dictated what he could remember of the declaration made by Morone to the chancellor, Seld, and then gave these notes to his theologians to be discussed.[1] Morone rightly considered it his principal duty to get on good terms with the various members of this commission. It was above all a question of working against a man whose extreme views had already repeatedly proved harmful to the Emperor's ecclesiastical policy.[2] This adviser of Ferdinand was not a German, but the Spanish Minorite, Francisco de Cordova. The activities of this zealous champion of the ideas of Constance and Basle caused Morone no little anxiety. He, therefore, interested himself strongly in confirming other members of the commission, such as Matthias Sittard and Conrad Braun, in their good dispositions, and in gaining their goodwill by gifts of money. This was not necessary in the case of Canisius, who was so loyal to the Holy See, but he also received 100 gold scudi, as an alms for the Society of Jesus. The lay advisers of the Emperor were also remembered by the legate with gifts of money and valuables, a custom which was frequently followed in diplomatic negotiations at that time.[3]

The former excellent relations existing between Morone and the Emperor now stood him in good stead. The negotiations were also facilitated by the Emperor's wish that the election of his son Maximilian as King of the Romans should be confirmed by the Pope as well as by the genuine Catholic sentiments of this Hapsburg prince, who was always well-intentioned, although not always far-seeing.

---

[1] *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 495 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* LÖWE, 61 *seq.*

[3] See Morone's reports of May 2, 6, and 17, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 281 *seq.*, 286 *seq.*, 311 *seq.* *Cf.* RITTER, I., 172. Concerning the 100 gold scudi received by Canisius for his Order, *cf.* CANISII Epist., IV., 971 *seq.* Of Fr. de Cordova it is very significant that he states that Morone refused *any* acceptance of reform (see SICKEL, Konzil, 502). It was very important that Gienger was not at Innsbruck.

There still remained, however, many difficulties to be surmounted. Morone found the opinion prevalent at the court that there was in Rome a spirit of opposition to all reforms. Not only the Emperor's advisers, but Ferdinand himself, could not be dissuaded from the view that difficulties would be put in the way of the decrees of the Council in the Curia, by granting dispensations.[1] It also caused considerable delay when the legate, soon after his arrival, fell ill with gout and fever, and was confined to his bed. The Emperor paid him the great honour of a visit, during the course of which he remarked that he wished to uphold the authority of the Pope, but also that of the Council. Morone replied by explaining the necessity of close co-operation between the Pope and the Council, quoting a remark of Cardinal Contarini, who was greatly esteemed by the Emperor, to the effect that it is the Pope who gives authority and power to the Council, but that the Council must also have great respect for the power of the successor of St. Peter. Morone also enlarged upon the blessing which united action on the part of the Pope and the Emperor would bring, not only on the work of reform, but also on the elucidation of other questions. The election of Maximilian as King, which was of great importance to the Emperor, was also touched upon.[2]

Ferdinand I. had promised to arrive at a speedy settlement of the negotiations. As he was still confined to his bed during the days that followed, Morone sent Delfino to the Emperor on May 3rd, to beg him to come to an early decision, without any exchange of letters; in this, however, he was not successful. Morone in the meantime sought to convince the chamberlain, Count Arco, and the Imperial theologians, who appeared at his bedside, of the genuineness of the Pope's intentions of reform, and to explain to them how impracticable were the demands of Ferdinand I. in the matters of the right of proposition, the reform of the head of the Church, and the representation of all the nations at Trent. He encountered so much opposition, especially with regard to the first point, that on May 6th he asked for instructions from Rome regarding the right of proposition, as to which the Pope had been prepared to give way at the time of his departure.[1]

---

[1] See Morone's report to Borromeo of May 2, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 282.

[2] See *ibid.*, 279 *seq.*

While Morone was successfully endeavouring, from his sick bed, to prevent the Imperial theologians from the treatment of new and dangerous questions, as for example, that of the supremacy of the Council,[2] his attempt to deal with the Emperor by word of mouth alone failed.

On May 7th, the Emperor again honoured the legate with a personal visit. He handed him, as the result of the deliberations of his theologians, a written answer to the discourse which Morone had delivered after his arrival, together with a supplement on the reform and election of the bishops.[3] Contrary to all expectations, the Emperor's reply was favourable; Morone, nevertheless, found in it three points to contest, which had from the first appeared to him to be most important: the right of proposition by the civil powers, the formation of national deputations for the preliminary discussion of conciliar questions, and, above all, the reform of the head of the Church by the Council. He laid his counter-observations, especially on the last point, before the Emperor, at an audience, which lasted three hours, granted to him on May 8th.[4] He had brought notes with him,[5] which formed the basis of his speech. The Emperor begged him to leave these notes with him, and as Morone could not very well refuse this request, he was thereby forced into negotiations which were partly in writing. Ferdinand handed Morone's reply to his theological commission, and received from it a counter-reply.[1] This latter did not seem quite satisfactory to Morone, although it was very favourably expressed in several important points. Only a limited right of proposition was now demanded, and the expression "reform of the head" was replaced by the words "reform of the universal Church, as it is called in the ancient Councils" a change which excluded the principles of the Councils of Constance and Basle. Other points were also modified, but the demand for the national deputations, and for a reform of the Papal elections by the Council were stili maintained.[2]

---

[1] See Morone's report to Borromeo of May 6, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 285 *seq.*

[2] See Morone's final report of May 17, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 304 *seq.*

[3] Published by PLANCK, Anecdota, II., 3 *seq.*, III., 3 *seqq.*, IV., 2 *seq.* *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 498; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 148 *seq.*

[4] See Morone's report to Borromeo of May 13, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 295 *seq.*

[5] Published under the title "C. Moronis replica ad S.C.M^{tis} responsum in materia concilii," by PLANCK, *loc. cit.*, V., 3 *seq.*

The Imperial reply was presented to Morone on May 12th. He had scarcely read it when Ferdinand appeared for a farewell visit, and the two now conferred for two hours longer.[3] The Emperor displayed great reverence for the Holy See, and for the person of the Pope, but in spite of this Morone did not succeed in obtaining all he desired. A full agreement, which was committed to writing,[4] was reached on the following points: the remaining dogmatic questions, especially those which had not been attacked by the innovators, were to be left aside; the fathers of the Council, as well as the envoys of the Emperor at Trent, were to be perfectly free to maintain their opinions, but they would be forbidden to digress from the subjects proposed for discussion, or to offend in their speeches against the rules of courtesy, or to display a want of consideration. The Pope was to leave to the Council full liberty to pass resolutions. In addition to the completion of the reforms already taken in hand, the Council should especially deal with the irregular election of bishops, and the exemptions of the cathedral chapters. Bishops were to be forced to fulfil the duty of residence, and the dispute as to divine right was to be settled in a peaceful manner. The appointment of a second secretary of the Council, who, however, was to be chosen by the Pope and the legates, was stated to be desirable. Ferdinand I. promised, as it was at present impossible for him to undertake the journey to Bologna for the coronation, to follow this ancient and praiseworthy custom of his predecessors as soon as time and circumstances should permit. Besides all this, they arranged, verbally, that in the event of a vacancy occurring in the Holy See during the time of the Council, the Emperor should use all his influence that their ancient right of choosing a new Pope should remain with the College of Cardinals.

---

[1] Published by SICKEL, Konzil, 498 *seq.*

[2] See Morone's report to Borromeo of May 13, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 297 *seq.* *Cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 500; HELLE, 56.

[3] See STEINHERZ, III., 299 *seq.*; *cf.* 310. See also SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 151.

[4] See the Summarium in LE PLAT, VI., 15; PLANCK, Anecdota, VI., 4 *seq.*; BUCHOLTZ, IX., 686. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 20, 15.

No agreement was arrived at concerning the national deputations, the right of proposition, or the conclave bull. Morone, therefore, caused the two principal advisers of the Emperor, Seld and Singmoser, to be summoned to him before his departure on May 12th, and explained to them his point of view with regard to these matters, and begged them to submit it to his majesty. Not content with this, he also drew up a memorial,[1] which he caused to be delivered to the Emperor by Delfino on the same day. The answer[2] was to be sent by Delfino to Matrei, the first posting station on the Brenner Pass, by which Morone was to travel on that day. It was prepared on the 13th, and was at once sent on to Morone ; Delfino was able, in doing so, to inform him that Seld had stated that the Emperor would not insist on the three points mentioned.[3] Morone found the Emperor's statements satisfactory. The demand for the national deputations, which now only appeared as a counsel, did not seem to him to be dangerous; he considered it, on the contrary, even advantageous, in so far as it was calculated to promote the acceptance of the decrees of the Council by all the nations. The fact that the Emperor expressly declared that the subjects proposed for discussion should only be prepared by these deputations, and then laid by them before the assembled fathers, to be decided by them by the majority of votes, could not but allay Morone's fears. With regard to the right of proposition of the legates, he was also relieved to see that the Emperor did not adhere to his demands. He looked upon the Emperor's proviso that, in the event of a refusal by the legates, the envoys could also make proposals, as being reasonable and just, and therefore believed that it would not be displeasing to the Pope either. With regard to the conclave bull, the answer of the Emperor was to the effect that for the time being he asked nothing further than that it should be carried out in the most exact and secure way, and that the secular ambassadors, as well as the electors in the conclave and the whole Roman populace, should be deterred from interference by the infliction of severe penalties; it would be best that these last should be settled by the Council. This extension of the conclave bull, Morone rightly did not consider in any way disadvantageous to the Pope; on the contrary, he thought that it would render the intrigues of the secular princes more difficult of execution. He therefore answered the Emperor without any hesitation, thanked him for the contents of the letter he had just received, and, in view of the goodwill shown by his majesty, expressed great hopes for the favourable progress of public affairs.[1]

---

[1] " Scriptum C. Moronis super duplica C.M$^{\text{tis}}$ " in PLANCK, V., 8 *seq.*

[2] According to the copy of the Acta of the Council in the Viceregal Archives, Innsbruck, published by SICKEL, Konzil, 500 *seq.* The *original in the Papal Secret Archives, Concilio, 31, n. 90b gives a better text in some places.

[3] See Morone's report to Borromeo of May 13, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 299-300.

In the final report which he sent to Rome, which in its simplicity, pertinency, and absence of vainglory, is a masterpiece,[2] Morone did not conceal his satisfaction that he had succeeded in blunting the dangerous aims of the bye-council at Innsbruck, and in convincing the Emperor of the sincere goodwill and the honourable intentions of the Pope.[1] If he was not perfectly satisfied with the result of his mission,[2] he could at any rate claim that what he had obtained was of no small importance, an opinion which was also shared by people of discernment. Canisius considered as the most important point of all that Morone had obtained, the fact that the passage on the "reform of the Church in its head and its members" had been deleted.[3] In Rome they were highly pleased with the work of the legate. "The Pope," writes Borromeo on May 19th to Morone, "has carefully read and considered your report of the 13th, and I can assure you that, during the whole of his reign, none of his diplomatists has given him greater satisfaction. The more difficult and critical the negotiations were, the greater are the merit and praise due to you." Borromeo wrote again in a similar appreciative way on May 27th.[4] The satisfaction of the Pope was all the greater as he had been prepared, in the last extremity, and in view of the coalition of the great Catholic powers, to grant the right of proposition to the envoys, and to allow the reform of the head of the Church to be discussed by the Council.[5]

---

[1] See Morone's final report of May 17, 1563, in STEINHERZ, III., 307 *seq.*

[2] The opinion of STEINHERZ, III., 313.

In forming an opinion on what had been accomplished by Morone the judgment of the opponents of Rome is not without importance. King Maximilian, to whom all the documents relating to the Innsbruck conferences were communicated, learned the result with much disgust. On May 24th he reproached his father with having given way too far; now that it was done, he said, it would be well that the Emperor should return to Vienna, and trouble himself no further about the Council.[1] The Cardinal of Lorraine, too, who was at that time in strong opposition to Rome, expressed his dissatisfaction at the Emperor's compliance, especially in the matter of the right of proposition.[2]

---

[1] See *ibid.* 311 *seq.* *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 20, 17, 11.

[2] According to a letter from Canisius to Lainez of May 17, 1563, Morone said this to him, referring especially to the national deputations; see Zeitschr. für Kath. Theologie, 1903, 642 *seq.*, and CANISII Epist., IV., 201 *seq.*

[3] See the letter from Canisius to Lainez, cited in the previous note, and that from the same to Hosius of May 17, 1563, in CANISII Epist., IV., 209 *seq.*

[4] See ŠUSTA, IV., 18, 31; *cf.* 14. See further STEINHERZ, III., 313. *Cf.* also PALLAVICINI, 20, 15, 11.

[5] *Cf.* STEINHERZ, III., 277, 305 *seq.*

In whatever way the results of the Innsbruck conferences may be judged, it is beyond doubt that the great diplomatic skill of Morone had brought about an understanding between the Emperor and the Pope.[3] His ability and prudence were also brilliantly displayed at Trent, to which city he returned on May 17th. Morone was just the man to take up the direction of affairs with a firm and safe hand, and to overcome all the difficulties which still stood in the way of bringing the Council to a successful conclusion.[1]

---

[1] See BUCHOLTZ, IX., 689. *Cf.* GOTZ, Beiträge zur Geschichte Albrechts V. in the Briefe und Akten, V., 263 n. 2; STEINHERZ, III., 313.

[2] See SICKEL, Konzil, 509.

[3] PALLAVICINI, who had at his disposal the report of Morone of May 17, and the correspondence with the Emperor, has given (20, 15) a very good account of the Innsbruck conferences. Instead of using this, RANKE (Päpste, I6., 218) lays the greatest stress upon a "Relatione sommaria del Card. Morone sopra la legatione sua" in the Altieri Library, and remarks concerning it that it is the most important document on the proceedings at Trent that he has come upon; neither Sarpi nor Pallavicini had noticed it. The *Relatione*, which is often to be found elsewhere (the authentic text in STEINHERZ, III., 312, in the Papal Secret Archives, Concilio, 31, n. 67; to the copies noted by SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 150 n., may be added one in the Archivio Borghese, Ser. 2, H. 18, p. 87 *seq.*), can hardly have been unknown to Pallavicini; he did not quote it because it is not certain whether it was written by Morone himself, or by Gherio (see STEINHERZ, *loc. cit.*). In any case this *Relatione*, which in the meantime has been published, though not quite accurately, by MAURENBRECHER in the Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., III., 653 *seq.*, can only be considered as of secondary importance, as it is drawn up in a shorter form, and appeared later, than the classical final report of Morone of May 17, which is remarkable for its clearness and precision, and to which Pallavicini rightly adheres. Ranke had all the more reason for putting forward this report, because it had already been noted by SCHELHORN (Sammlung für die Geschicte, I., 210). But Ranke paid no attention, either to Schelhorn, or to the very important publication of the correspondence between Morone and the Emperor by Planck. The

---

consequence was that he was only able to give a very unsatisfactory account, in which the result of Morone's mission appears in too favourable a light. The first to take up an opposite position was Ritter (Deutsche Geschicte, I., 173 *seq.*; *cf.* Ritter, L. v. Ranke, Stuttgart, 1895), but Ritter goes to the other extreme, and considers the agreement brought about by Morone as only apparent. Steinherz (III., 330) has taken up a stand against this view, appealing also to the judgment of contemporaries who were well informed of the true state of affairs. A follower of Ritter, Helle, has tried, in his dissertation, Die Konferenzen Morones, to defend the opinion of his master. Holtzmann, a very reliable authority for that period of history, has rightly declared against him in the Histor. Zeitschr., CVII., 436 *seqq.*; he says: "It is true that, even after the conferences, the Emperor adhered to his programme of reform, though in a somewhat modified form. But it seems to me that, all the same, Morone's influence was not quite without effect, and I should, in particular, estimate Ferdinand's abandonment of the *reformatio in capite* somewhat differently from Helle (p. 56, 64). The way had been paved in all respects for an agreement, and later on it was but completed with the help of other things. In particular, the recognition of the election of Maximilian was very skilfully held up before the Emperor by Morone as the price of reconciliation; *cf.* my book on Maximilian, p. 450." Kassowitz (p. xliii) and v. Voltelini (Mitteilungen des Österr. Inst., XXVII., 353) also agree with Steinherz.

[1] Concerning the services of Morone see Šusta, IV., p. v.; there see also details of the manuscript tradition of the correspondence which issued from the work of Morone in 1563. For the "Cifra Moroniana" see Šusta, in the Mitteilungen des Österr. Inst., XVIII., and Meister, Die Geheimschrift im Dienste der päpstl. Kurie, 243. At Trent Morone resided in the Palazzo Thun; see Swoboda, 23.

CHAPTER X.

THE CONCLUDING SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

WHILE Morone, as legate, and as the confidant of Pius IV., was paving the way for an understanding with the Emperor at Innsbruck, relations between the Spanish king and the Pope were also taking a more favourable turn. Philip's representative in Rome since 1559, Francisco de Vargas, had been in no small degree to blame for the irritation and disputes between Rome and Madrid. Vargas was not a man who could smooth difficulties away; he was much more likely to render existing friction more acute. Over-zealous and violent, quarrelsome and contentious, he was the most unlikely person to obtain anything from Pius IV. In just the same degree as the relations between the Venetian ambassador, Mula, and the Pope were excellent, so did those between Pius IV. and Vargas go from bad to worse. Philip II. himself could not fail to recognize that Vargas' position at the Curia had become unbearable, and his successor, Luis de Requesens, had been appointed as early as the beginning of 1562, although his departure had been delayed from month to month.[1]

In August, 1562, Philip II. had formed the idea of sending to Rome a special confidential envoy, in order to settle the differences which existed in the matter of the Council. He chose for the purpose the aged and experienced Luis de Avila, but put off sending him until the beginning of December, as he wished, before doing so, to come to an agreement with the other Catholic powers with regard to his further procedure at Trent.[2]

---

[1] *Cf.* ŠUSTA, I., 157, II., 427, 514, III., 344, 386; CONSTANT, Rapport 194 *seq.*, 211 *seq.*, where is also given the special bibliography on Requesens.

[2] See ŠUSTA, II., 522; III., 83, 88, 385 *seq.*, 411, 442 *seq.*, 446-7.

The longer the mission of Avila, from which a favourable turn in the matter of the Council was hoped for in Rome, was delayed, the greater was the impatience with which the arrival of Philip's representative was awaited. In the middle of February, 1563, his appearance was thought to be imminent, but a full month had to elapse before Avila made his entry into Rome on March 14th, 1563. It was in keeping with the honourable reception accorded to him that he was assigned lodgings in the Vatican, in the apartments of Federigo Borromeo. Negotiations were begun two days later, and if they were at first of a somewhat excited character, this was to be explained by the disappointment which Pius IV. experienced when Avila presented the numerous and important demands of his sovereign.[1] In order to understand the attitude of the Pope, one must realize the dangers which confronted him on all sides. At Trent, where the proceedings were at a standstill, the Bishop of Fünfkirchen, who was in high favour with the Emperor, was declaring quite openly that the power of the Pope was no greater than that of any other patriarch, and the Archbishop of Granada expressed himself in similar terms.[2] At Innsbruck the Imperial commission of theologians was holding its sessions, and was very similar to a Council; no one could foretell what success the impending mission of Morone to the court of Ferdinand I. was likely to have.[3] In France, the most important champions of the Catholic Church, Marshal St. André, and François de Guise, had fallen, while Montmorency was a prisoner. It was only too well known to Pius IV. that the government of Catherine de' Medici considered that, faced as they were by the Huguenots, the only way to safety lay in compliance. The queen had, in fact, granted to them on March 12th, at the Peace of Amboise, religious liberty, even though it was to some extent limited, accepting at the same time the monstrous proposal that a new Council should be summoned in Germany or France, and renewed attempts made to attract the Protestants to it.[1]

---

[1] See Šusta, III., 239, 286, 531, 538, where there is a further bibliography.

[2] *Cf.* Baluze-Mansi, III., 454; Šusta, III., 282.

[3] See Sickel, Beiträge, II., 57.

Under these circumstances, Pius IV. was forced to enter into still closer relations with the only Catholic power which would not listen to any talk of yielding to the religious innovators ; the more hesitating the attitude of the Emperor, and the greater the tension in France, the more the Pope had to rely on Philip II.[2] In order to obtain effective assistance from him, the Pope at last came to the momentous resolve, not only of giving way with regard to the exclusive right of proposition by the legates, but also of deciding the dispute about precedence between the Spanish and French envoys at Trent, in the manner desired in Madrid. An agreement was reached in the first week of May, and two documents, mutually binding, were exchanged. In that of May 6th, Avila and Vargas, as the representatives of Philip II., gave a solemn promise that their sovereign would defend the authority of the Pope with all his power. Pius IV. thereupon wrote on May 8th to the legates at Trent that they were to explain to the fathers that the liberty of the Council was not to be affected by the words *proponentibus legatis*, which had been entered in the decree without his previous knowledge.[3] On the same day the Pope, without wishing definitely to decide the dispute as to precedence in the matter of the place to be assigned to the representatives of Spain at the sessions and congregations, gave way to the wishes of Philip II., who had based his threat, made on March 5th, of breaking off diplomatic relations, on the lukewarm attitude taken up in Rome on this question.[4]

---

[1] See STEINHERZ, III., 265 ; MAURENBRECHER, Archivalische Beiträge, 5 ; BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 250. *Cf.* Vol. XVI. of this work.

[2] See SICKEL, Konzil, 514 ; BEITRÄGE, II., 58.

[3] See PALLAVICINI, 21, 5, 7 ; MAURENBRECHER, *loc. cit.*, 20 ; Venetian Despatches, III., 226 ; SICKEL, Beiträge, II., 58, 134 *seq.*

[4] See PALLAVICINI, 21, 1, 6-7 ; SICKEL, Beiträge, II., 58 *seq.*, 133 *seq.* Sickel rightly brings out how well Pallavicini has described the effect produced at Trent by the new instructions.

Morone, who had successfully defended the exclusive right of proposition by the legates against the Emperor at Innsbruck, was as much embarrassed as dismayed at the compliance shown by Pius IV. to Philip II. in this respect. The new Spanish envoy, Count di Luna,[1] who had arrived in the place of Pescara, naturally insisted on the fulfilment of the concessions granted to his sovereign, and all the efforts of Morone to induce him to change his mind were in vain. The other legates supported Morone, and in a letter to Borromeo on June 19th, 1563, they protested against the limitation of their exclusive right of proposition, expressing the wish to be recalled from the Council, rather than remain as witnesses of their own discomfiture.[2]

Even before this painful incident, there had been no lack of other occurrences which caused Morone and his colleagues grave anxiety, and placed them in no small embarrassment.[3] Not the least of these was the ever smouldering dispute about precedence between the French and Spanish envoys, in which the question was always coming more and more into the foreground of what place was to be assigned to the representative of the Catholic King in ecclesiastical functions, and how the kiss of peace and the incensation were to be carried out. In this matter Pius IV. came to the conclusion,

---

For the progress of Avila's negotiations see DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I. 489 *seq.*, 517 *seq.*; MAURENBRECHER, *loc. cit.*, 17 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, III., 531 *seq.*, 538 *seq.*

[1] For his introduction into the General Congregation on May 5th, 1563, and the question of precedence which then arose, see BONDONUS, 567; THEINER, II., 280 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 21, 1. Luna took up his residence in the Palazzo Roccabruna (now Sardagna); see SWOBODA, 23, 49.

[2] See PALLAVICINI, 21, 5; ŠUSTA, IV., 67 *seq.*, 71 *seq.*, 78 *seq.*

[3] For the question raised by the Archbishop of Lanciano as to the right of voting by proxies, see PALLAVICINI, 20, 17, 7 *seq.*; STEINHERZ, III., 324 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, III., 333; IV., 13 *seqq.* The demand for the chalice for the laity on the part of the Bavarian envoy led to the successful mission of Ormanetto; see STEINHERZ III., 327 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, IV., 23, 28.

on June 8th, that it was his duty to decide in favour of Spain, and he expressly gave as his reason that Philip II. must at that time be looked upon as the principal support of the Catholic religion.[1]

Above all, however, the legates were preoccupied with the question concerning the episcopate and the primacy, which had recently once again broken out into flame. Even the preliminary discussions concerning the abuses connected with Holy Orders, which lasted from May 12th to June 16th,[2] as well as the later ones on the ordination of priests,[3] which began on June 11th, made it clear that an agreement on these questions was hardly to be expected. While the Archbishop of Granada was for ever proclaiming the divine right of the bishops, others, especially the French bishops, were indulging in the most violent censures of the real and supposed abuses in the Curia. The Bishop of Paris, who wished to see the discussions on the reform of the Curia put in the first place, recommended the restoration of the ancient mode of electing bishops, according to which the Pope would have to renounce his right of nomination. According to the wishes of many, the right of dispensation must also be withdrawn from the head of the Church, and the election of the Pope regulated by the Council.[4]

In the final assembly, on June 16th, Lainez, the General of the Jesuits, maintained with the greatest firmness that the Pope, as head of the Church, could not be reformed by the Council. Reform, he declared, is a return to old ways; there is an interior reform as well as an exterior one, and the latter must be subsidiary to the former; all reform must presuppose the immutability of the divine law. Not everything, however, is divine law which the fathers of the Council honour with this title. Lainez then proceeded to demonstrate once more the fundamental difference between order and jurisdiction. To have a vote in the Council is a matter of jurisdiction; the possession of a diocese is not essential to the episcopal dignity. The assertion that titular bishops are not real bishops is false; in Germany such bishops are indispensable on account of the extent of the dioceses. Dispensations cannot be avoided, and Lainez was most emphatic in his declaration that the Pope has his right of dispensation direct from Christ; no one can deprive him of it or limit it. He answered the argument that the Pope might sometimes use this right badly, by saying that the same thing could be said of every prince and every superior. Finally, he strongly insisted that the reform of the Roman Curia could be carried out in the best and most effective manner by the Pope himself, opposing most resolutely those who maintained the superiority of the Council over the Pope.[1]

---

[1] See PALLAVICINI, 21, 8, 4; SICKEL, Beiträge, II., 60 *seq.*, 62 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, IV., 62, 82 *seq.*, 495 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* THEINER, II., 270-301; *ibid.*, 264-70, the drawing up of the list of abuses relative to Holy Orders, which was brought before the fathers of the Council on May 10. See also Psalmaeus in MERKLE, II., 838 *seqq.* For the later proceedings, from July 10 to 12, see THEINER, II., 302-9.

[3] See Paleotto in THEINER, II., 617 *seq.* *Cf.* ŠUSTA, IV., 54 *seq.*

[4] *Cf.* GRISAR, Primat, 773 *seq.*

It is not to be wondered at that such outspoken and determined language failed to appeal to many of his hearers, especially the French bishops, imbued as they were with Gallican views. In their reports to Rome, the legates bestowed great praise on the General of the Jesuits, expressing, however, a desire for greater reserve and prudence.[2]

Lainez also energetically defended the rights of the Holy See at the renewed discussions in July on the sacrament of Holy Orders.[3] This was all the more necessary, as the French bishops made violent protests against every expression which suggested the superiority of the Pope over the Council, or acceptance of the Council of Florence and repudiation of that of Basle. The ultimate aim of the French was to undermine the monarchical character of the organization of the Church, in the sense of the Council of Basle. The Spanish bishops, indeed, acknowledged the Council of Florence, but remained firm on the point that the institution and jurisdiction of the episcopate was of divine right, and must therefore be declared to be so. On account of the extent of their dioceses, and the richness of their benefices, they hoped everything from the strengthening of the episcopal power, and would have liked to become popes in their own dioceses; they also endeavoured to weaken the authority of the Cardinals in every possible way. The Italians, and with them a few Spanish and French bishops, as well as the very small number of bishops of other nations who were present, declared themselves, almost without exception, on the side of the power and dignity of the Holy See.[1]

---

[1] See THEINER, II., 300; PALEOTTO, *ibid.*, 660; PALLAVICINI, 21, 6, 9; GRISAR, Primat, 777 *seq.*; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 156 *seq.*

[2] See SICKEL, Konzil, 547 *seq.*: GUILLEMIN, Le card. de Lorraine, 346; ŠUSTA, IV., 69.

[3] See GRISAR, Primat, 781.

In all these controversies, which were conducted with the greatest violence, secular interests also played a part; the Imperial envoys, however, in accordance with the agreement reached by Morone, worked for the elimination of theoretical questions, as to which there was no possibility of agreement. The view of Pius IV. was that it was preferable to come to no decision with regard to the question of jurisdiction, and that of the universal primacy, than to adopt a half decision, which would give occasion for disputes later on.[2] The legates had already written to Rome in April that there was no other way than to avoid the contested points altogether, and in the doctrinal chapter and canons to speak only of the power of order, without mentioning jurisdiction. Lainez had already proposed this solution on a former occasion,[3] and an agreement on those lines was actually reached at the beginning of July. A satisfactory form of the decree on residence was also arrived at on July 7th, which, in all essentials, was in accordance with that which had formerly been drafted by Cardinal Gonzaga; no mention was made in this of divine right. On July 9th a General Congregation was held, in which they were successful in obtaining 227 votes for the decrees thus formulated. Only slight alterations were asked for, with the insertion of which Archbishop Marini, of Lanciano, and Foscarari, Bishop of Modena, as theologians, and Archbishop Castagna, of Rossano, and Gabriele Paleotto, Auditor of the Rota, as canonists, were entrusted.[1] This happy result, in consequence of which the XXIIIrd Session, which had been repeatedly postponed, first from April 22nd to May 20th, then to June 15th, and finally to July 15th,[2] could at last be held, was above all to be attributed to the complete change of front on the part of Cardinal Guise, the leader of the French bishops.

---

[1] See the classic letter of the legates, already used by Pallavicini on the different national groups at Trent, of June 14, 1563, in Šusta, IV., 64 *seq.*

[2] See Pallavicini, 21, 11, 1.

[3] See Grisar, Primat, 779 *seq.*

As early as June 29th, while the scandalous dispute about precedence between the French and Spanish envoys was taking place in the Cathedral of Trent, the passionate Frenchman, deeply offended at the preference shown to Spain, had permitted himself to the use of the most violent expressions concerning Pius IV., the lawfulness of whose election he declared to be doubtful, on account of alleged simony, and he had threatened to make an appeal to the Council.[3] A few days later he offered the Pope his services, through his secretary, Musotti. Sudden changes from one extreme to the other are natural to the French character. In this change on the part of Cardinal Guise from strong opposition to becoming the supporter of the Pope, personal reasons had contributed no less than objective ones. Pius IV. had previously made him the offer of appointing him perpetual legate in France after the close of the Council and of entrusting him with full powers, as, for example, the granting of the chalice to the laity, things which to an ambitious man, where very tempting. While on the one hand, the prospect of a great and honourable activity in his own country attracted the Cardinal, on the other hand he shrank from plunging his beloved France, already so sorely tried, into the confusion of a schism.[1] His startling change of front was at the same time made easier for him by the amicable settlement arrived at with the Spanish envoy, which was acceptable to the French court.[2]

---

[1] See PALLAVICINI, 21, 11, 4; ŠUSTA, IV., 111, 121 *seq.* For G. Paleotto see MERKLE in the Röm. Quartalschr., XI., 336 *seq.*, and on G. B. Castagna, Studi stor., IX., 229 *seq.*

[2] See THEINER, II., 263 *seq.*, 279, 298 *seq.*

[3] For this question, and the proceedings connected with it, see BONDONUS, 568; PSALMAEUS, 861; MENDOÇA, 684; *report of Fr. Porticelli to Madruzzo, dated Trent, July 1, 1563 (Viceregal Archives Innsbruck); Paleotto in THEINER, II., 650. *Cf.* MERKLE *loc. cit.*, 387; BALUZE-MANSI, III., 477; IV., 319; LE PLAT, VI., 116 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 21, 8 *seq*; SICKEL, Konzil, 556 *seqq.*, Beiträge, II., 63, 135 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, IV., 99, 517 *seq.* On May 22, 1563, Fr. Tonina had already reported from Rome: *Qui si ragiona assai del strepito che fa il card. di Lorena al concilio (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

In the General Congregation of July 14th an agreement had been come to by almost all the fathers with regard to the whole of the decrees. Only the Spanish bishops, with the exception of the Bishop of Lerida, were still opposed to the wording of the sixth canon, but this difficulty was overcome by the skilful intervention of Morone. The legate appealed to Count di Luna, who succeeded in overcoming the opposition of his countrymen, and the same night communicated the fact to Morone.[3]

On the morning of July 15th, the four legates, Cardinals Guise and Madruzzo, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, a hundred and ninety-three bishops, three abbots, seven generals of orders, three doctors of law, a hundred and thirty theologians, six procurators of bishops who were absent, and twelve envoys, assembled in the Cathedral of Trent for the XXIIIrd Session, the seventh under Pius IV.[4]

---

[1] See STEINHERZ, III., 379 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, IV., 102 *seq.*, 121 *seq.*, and the sources there cited.

[2] See SICKEL, Konzil 562; ŠUSTA, IV., 120, 127.

[3] See PALLAVICINI, 21, 11, 7; ŠUSTA, IV., 124.

[4] *Cf.* THEINER, II., 310-2; RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 125-7; BECCADELLI, II., 93 *seqq.*; PSALMAEUS, 866 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 21, 12.

High Mass was celebrated by the Bishop of Paris, Eustache du Bellay, and the sermon was preached by the Spaniard, Giacomo Giberto di Noguera, Bishop of Alife. Then the decree on Holy Orders, in four chapters and eight canons, was read aloud. Of the bishops it was stated in the fourth chapter: "In addition to the other grades, there belong in a special way to this hierarchical order the bishops, who have succeeded to the place of the Apostles, and, as the Apostle says, have been set by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God." Although this formula did not directly define divine right, the Spanish bishops had at last declared it to be satisfactory, because it could be interpreted in their sense.[1]

The last three canons, so long disputed, were as follows: "Anathema is pronounced against anyone who maintains that in the Catholic Church there is no hierarchy, appointed by divine ordinance, and consisting of bishops, priests and ministers; that bishops are no more than priests, and have not the power to confirm and ordain, or that they have their power in common with priests, or that the ordination conferred by them without the consent of, or without the call of the people or the civil authorities, is invalid, or that those who are not properly ordained and appointed by ecclesiastical and canonical authority, but come from elsewhere, are legitimate ministers of the divine word and of the sacraments; that the bishops who are chosen by the Roman Pope are not true and lawful bishops, but a human institution."

The first president, Morone, was able to announce, as the result of the voting, that all the fathers approved the decrees, that six wished for a better and clearer declaration in the sixth and eighth canons, and one in the fourth. Then the reform decree, which included eighteen chapters, the first of which was concerned with the duty of residence, was publicly read. The second chapter laid it down that all prelates without exception, even the Cardinals, must receive Holy Orders within three months. The next fourteen chapters contained precise regulations for the conferring and reception of the various orders, as well as to the qualities necessary for those who were to be ordained. The rules in the last chapter, the eighteenth, as to the training and education of future priests, were of great importance. All the bishops, it laid down, were to found institutions, seminaries in which boys could be trained for the priesthood from twelve years of age and upwards. This enactment, by which the theological faculties were by no means abolished, aimed at affording the opportunity of theological study, together with protection from moral dangers, to all youths, especially such as were without means.

---

[1] See KNÖPFLER in the Freiburger Kirchenlex., XI^2., 2105.

Divine right was again not mentioned in the decree as to residence; several of the fathers, nevertheless, were of opinion that certain words in it might be interpreted in that sense. The number of those who objected, however, to this hotly debated decree, or who accepted it only conditionally, or objected to certain passages, was only eleven. The Bishop of Feltre, Francesco Campegio, protested against the decree, though he declared his readiness to submit to the decision of the Pope; all the other fathers gave their approval. The other reform decrees were accepted by a simple *placet*, with the exception of six votes. Finally, unanimous approval was given to the decree read at the close, appointing September 16th for the next Session, when the sacrament of Matrimony, and other doctrinal points which had not yet been decided, the provision of bishoprics, and other reforms, would be dealt with.

This happy ending of the seventh Session filled the Pope and the legates with the greatest joy, and confirmed them in their intention of completing as quickly as possible the remaining tasks of the Council. The policy of Philip II., however, put serious obstacles in their way. It soon became apparent that in Spain they were working for the prolongation of the Council, and the proposal of Count di Luna once more to invite the Protestants had no other object in view.[1]

---

[1] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 22, 1; STEINHERZ, III., 381; ŠUSTA, IV., 129 *seq.*

The consideration that the Council afforded him an excellent means of bringing pressure to bear on Pius IV., and of forcing him to concessions in other matters, was certainly the principal reason for Philip's conduct.[1] The Pope understood this very well, but his superior statesmanship nevertheless enabled him to frustrate the aims of the Spanish king. While always strengthening the understanding with Cardinal Guise, which was of so great importance as far as his countrymen was concerned, Pius IV. understood in a masterly way how to complete the work begun by Morone, and to win over the Emperor to the conclusion of the Council. As an effective lever for this purpose he made skilful use of the recognition of Maximilian's election as king, and Morone stood loyally by the side of Pius IV. in all his efforts. As early as July 20th, the legate wrote to Ferdinand I., representing to him that a further prolongation of the proceedings of the Council could only be harmful to the Church, and begging him to agree to its conclusion, and to induce Philip II. to withdraw his opposition.[2]

At Trent, on July 20th, the legates laid before the fathers of the Council eleven canons on the sacrament of Matrimony, and a decree which declared clandestine marriages invalid, as well as those contracted by minors without the consent of their parents.[3] A considerable number of the fathers, among them the legate Hosius himself, were opposed to any change with regard to clandestine marriages, and on this and cognate questions there arose long and difficult discussions, which lasted far into the autumn.

Important deliberations on general reform were being carried on at the same time; in this connection, Pius IV. expressly declared that the Cardinals must also be reformed by the Council.[4] nor were the laity to be excepted from the general reform, a point of view which had long been maintained by persons of discernment. The nuncio Commendone, long before the reopening of the Council, and as the result of his observations in Germany, had drawn attention to the numerous usurpations of ecclesiastical goods and rights on the part of the civil authorities, which gravely violated canon law, and infringed on the liberties of the Church, adding a demand that, to the reform of the Curia, must be joined that of the princes and their governments.[1]

---

[1] See the letter of the legates of July 12, 1563, in Šusta, IV., 122.

[2] See Raynaldus, 1563, n. 160; Sickel, Konzil, 563; Steinherz, III., 382; Šusta, IV., 135.

[3] See Theiner, II., 313 *seq.*; Šusta, IV., 136.

[4] *Cf.* Pallavicini, 22, 1; Sägmüller, Papstwahlbullen, 161 *seq.*; Šusta, IV., 127.

The remarks of Commendone on the oppression of the Church in Germany, even by Catholic princes, were fully justified. The German princes had been working successfully since the XIVth century to bring at least the whole of the "external affairs of the Church" into subjection to their authority, to obtain free disposal of ecclesiastical property, to fill all the lucrative ecclesiastical offices, and to exercise control over all ecclesiastical ordinances. In the confusion and distress of the XVth and XVIth centuries not a few Popes had made far-reaching concessions in this respect, and had permitted various princes to share in the regulation of purely ecclesiastical matters. These concessions, which could only be excused by the miseries of the times, soon came to be looked upon as a permanent right by the sovereigns, who, "where there was no question of faith involved," intended to govern "freely in the affairs of the ministers of the Church and their possessions." In open contradiction to the principles of canon law, according to which the Church possesses the property, and her various members are only granted its use, the officials of the princes and the nobility in Austria as in Bavaria disposed of ecclesiastical goods and foundations as they pleased.[2] It was hardly an exaggeration when Cardinal Truchsess maintained that even in Catholic states it was no longer the bishops who governed, but the princes and their officials.[3]

---

[1] See DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, III., 310.

[2] See JANSSEN-PASTOR, IV $^{15-16}$., 164 *seq.*; *Cf.* I ^{20}., 753, and Vol. VII. of this work, p. 293 *seq.*

[3] Letter from Rome, September 17, 1563, in JANSSEN-PASTOR, IV $^{15-16}$, 163 *seq.*

To a still greater degree was this the case in France and in the widespread dominions of the Spanish crown, in Naples, Sicily and Spain itself.[1] Pius IV. was therefore perfectly justified when, in April, 1563, he made complaints to the ambassador of Philip II. about the usurpation of ecclesiastical rights by the Spanish government, and threatened to lay the matter before the Council at Trent to be dealt with there. In saying this he referred especially to church patronage, the office of grand master, the Inquisition, etc. All clear-sighted people, and especially Cardinal Morone, were of opinion that when they were dealing with general reform in the Council, the princes must not be excepted.[2] In April the Bishop of Orvieto drew up a memorial on the encroachments of the secular princes in spiritual matters, and sent it to Rome.[3] On the strength of this Borromeo gave the legates strict injunctions on June 26th to place this subject on the agenda for the Council,[4] which was accordingly done.

At the end of July a detailed draft of reform in forty-two chapters was drawn up,[5] which was handed to the envoys of the princes, so that they might make their observations upon it. This draft was so comprehensive, that the idea, so firmly rooted in the minds of many of the envoys, that the Council would only occupy itself with the redress of unimportant matters in the organization of the Church, was completely destroyed. The envoys were all the more dismayed, as the thirty-ninth chapter contained a number of strict regulations tending to ensure the liberty of the Church against the interference and encroachment of the civil power. The first draft, which was subsequently much modified, was to the following effect: the princes are forbidden, under pain of excommunication, all interference in purely spiritual matters, while the observance of the ancient privileges of the Church is enjoined on them. The following demands are made on behalf of the Church: free jurisdiction, freedom in all matters which immediately or mediately concern the ecclesiastical forum, and, under limitations which were minutely detailed, exemption from taxes, burdens of state, and public offices which had been unlawfully imposed. Princes are not to confer or in any way grant expectancies to prelates or chapters, and they are to leave untouched ecclesiastical properties and rights, as well as the properties and rights of such lay persons as are under ecclesiastical patronage. The servants, soldiers and horses of princes must not in future be quartered in the houses of ecclesiastics or monasteries; the *exequatur* or so-called *placet* of the princes must be unconditionally abolished.

---

[1] Fuller details in Vol. XVI. of this work

[2] Letter of Vargas of April 6, 1563, in DÖLLINGER, Beiträge, I., 509.

[3] See RITTER, I., 171.

[4] Poichè ogn' uno ci dà adosso con questa benedetta riforma et par quasi che non s' indrizzino i colpi ad altro che a ferir l' autorità di questa santa sede et noi altri cardinali che siamo membri di quella, N.S^{re} dice che per l' amor di Dio lascino o faccino cantare ancora sopra il libro de li principi secolari et che in ciò non habbino rispetto alcuno, in le cose però che sono giuste et honeste, et anche in questo haveranno a procurare che non paia che la cosa venga da noi. ŠUSTA, IV., 100-1. *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 22, 9, 1.

[5] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 22, 1, 12; BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 363 *seq.;* SICKEL, Konzil, 573 *seq.;* KASSOWITZ, 234 *seq.;* CONSTANT, Rapport, 333; ŠUSTA, IV., 140 *seq.*

The representatives of Ferdinand I., whose zeal for reform had, since June, under the influence of the theological commission, again come to the fore with increased bitterness,[1] were the first to hand to the legates their views on the forty-two chapters of July 31st. On August 3rd the French and Portuguese envoys presented their observations, which the Imperial envoy at once sent to his master. On August 7th, the Spanish envoy, Count di Luna, submitted his remarks, and, true to his previous policy of obstruction, demanded that the reform commission should be made up by nations.[2]

---

[1] See the so-called third reform libellum of June 5, 1563, in SICKEL, Konzil, 520 *seq.*; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 154 *seq.*

[2] See SICKEL, Konzil, 571 *seq.*; KASSOWITZ, 240 *seq.*; ŠUSTA, IV., 140 *seq.*, 149 *seq.*, 158 *seq.*, 163 *seqq.*

The demand that the civil authorities should also be submitted to reform roused a violent storm of protest among the great Catholic powers, all the more so as many of the requirements put forward were too strictly conceived, and were based upon a canonical point of view which, owing to the changed conditions, had become impossible.[1] It is beyond question that the whole subject of the reform of the princes had been brought forward for the purpose of moderating the reform requirements of the secular powers with regard to the spiritual authorities, by calling attention to their own shortcomings, but the opinion expressed at the time, that the strict secular reform had been so closely bound up with the ecclesiastical in order that both might be abandoned at the protest of the princes, was a wicked insinuation.[2] When even Ferdinand I. repeated this assertion,[3] it clearly shows the sway exercised over this well-meaning but easily influenced monarch by his advisers. It is not surprising that Philip II. at once made complaints in Rome, through his ambassadors, on the subject of the reform of the princes,[4] because, should the Council adopt the projected measures, Spain would be more affected than any other country, since the government of no other Catholic state allowed so much oppression of the Church as was permitted there.[5]

In the meantime Philip's envoy at Trent was endeavouring by subterfuges of every kind to bring about a delay in the activities of the Council. Although the Count di Luna had made countless observations upon the other articles of reform, he now refused to do so with regard to the reform of the princes, so that it might not seem that he in any way sanctioned it.[6] The difficulties which were thus caused for the legates were still further increased by the fact that the great differences of opinion on the sacrament of Matrimony, especially the prohibition of clandestine marriages, tended to become greater rather than less. This subject was discussed from July 24th to the 31st, again, upon a new formula from August 11th to the 23rd, and lastly, upon yet a third formula, from September 7th to the 10th.[1]

---

[1] See SÄGMÜLLER, *loc. cit.*, 163.

[2] The opinion of SÄGMÜLLER, *loc. cit.*

[3] Letter of Ferdinand I. to his orators at the Council of August 23, 1563, in SICKEL, Konzil, 585.

[4] *Cf.* PALLAVICINI, 22, 9, 2; Venice also raised objections; see CECCHETTI, II., 43 *seq.*

[5] *Cf.* Vol. XVI. of this work

[6] See Paleotto in THEINER, II., 663.

Notwithstanding the great difficulties which stood in the way of the settlement of the decree on Matrimony, as well as those on reform, Pius IV., convinced of the necessity of bringing the Council to an end without taking into consideration the opposition of Spain, urged the hurrying on of the proceedings with ever increasing vehemence.[2] In this respect the legates had already done all that they possibly could,[3] but the difficulties increased from day to day. They had at last, after repeated conferences, succeeded in finding a new formula for the articles on reform, which now consisted of thirty-six chapters. This was sent to the Emperor on August 20th. The last chapter treated of the reform of the princes in twelve articles.[4] Its form was so moderate that the legates entertained the hope that it would meet with universal approval. Great, therefore, was their astonishment and dismay when the Archbishop of Prague appeared on August 27th, and demanded in the name of the Emperor that they should abandon the reform of the princes.[5] They very reasonably expressed their surprise that this request should now be made, since the Emperor had always insisted so strongly on general reform, and Morone was quite outspoken in telling the Archbishop of Prague his opinion. On former occasions bitter complaints had been made when the legates sought to learn the opinion of the Pope before they submitted questions to the Council, and yet the Pope was not only their prince, but also that of the Church. Now, however, when the Pope had practically waived this right, and at the same time empowered the Council to act in all matters without previous intimation to Rome, the Emperor wished to dictate to the Council that such and such an article is not to be dealt with. Neither the legates nor the fathers of the Council were prepared to submit to such a lowering of the Papal dignity, or such a violation of the freedom of the Council. At length, in order to avoid an open breach between the Emperor and the Council, they decided that the Archbishop of Prague should ask for further instructions from Ferdinand I., to which course Cardinal Guise also agreed.[1]

---

[1] See THEINER, II., 314-34, 338-69, 391-7; PALLAVICINI, 22, 4.

[2] See the instructions of Borromeo to the legates of August 4, 1563, in ŠUSTA, IV., 169 *seqq.*; the important letter from Borromeo and Pius IV. to the legates of August 7, in SICKEL, Beiträge, II., 149 *seqq.*; Borromeo's letter of August 14, in ŠUSTA, IV., 186, and the autograph letter from the Pope to the legates on the same day in SICKEL, *loc. cit.*, 152.

[3] See their report of August 19, 1563, in ŠUSTA, IV., 189 *seqq.*

[4] See THEINER, II., 371-86; SICKEL, Konzil, 582 *seq.*; KASSOWITZ, 256 *seq.*

[5] The instruction from the Emperor, of August 23, 1563 (in SICKEL, Konzil, 585; *cf.* KASSOWITZ 245) was brought by a courier from Vienna to Trent in three days.

During these negotiations, Morone, in his easily understood excitement, had made use of such strong expressions that he thought it well to send a letter of explanation to the Emperor; he remained, however, quite firm on the piont, and defended his views in a second letter which he addressed to Ferdinand in the attempt to dissuade him from his opposition to the arguments put forward by the legates. In this letter he submitted the following statements: the reform decree was in the first instance handed to all the envoys, so that it might, after it had been amended in accordance with their suggestions, finally be laid before the fathers. Several articles, to which the envoys had taken exception, we either altered or entirely withdrew. We have urgently begged every one of the envoys to give us his own views upon the matter, so that if anything now appears in the decree to which one or another takes exception, it is not our fault, but that of the person who kept silent. It is, however, quite out of the question for us to let the whole decree lapse, or even to postpone it to another time, without causing the greatest scandal, throwing everything into confusion. Almost the whole of the bishops are convinced that if the reform of the whole ecclesiastical body is to be taken in hand, those obstacles must be removed by which the bishops are completely paralysed in the government of their churches by the civil authorities. Should those obstacles not be removed, the reform will be not only defective, but useless, and all the trouble which your majesty and we ourselves have taken will have been wasted. The whole of the contents of the decree correspond, not only with canon law, but also with laws which have been made by pious Emperors. Not all the oppressions suffered by the clergy, nor all the encroachments on the liberty of the Church are mentioned in it, many such things having been omitted on account of the circumstances of the times, especially such things as might disturb the peace of Germany, or seem to hamper the defence against the hereditary enemy of Christendom. As the opponents of our true religion are most violently bent on the expulsion and destruction of the bishops and other clergy, it is only right that the Council and the Catholic princes should support them in their ecclesiastical ministry, and uphold their dignity especially as we may hope, in virtue of the regulations already issued, or about to be issued, to have as bishops men who are learned, prudent, eminently pious and worthy of respect; people cannot be brought back from vice to virtue, from false doctrines to true piety, by bishops who possess no real authority.[3]

---

[1] *Cf.* the report of the legates of August 28, 1563, already used by Pallavicini, in Šusta, IV., 200 *seq.* *Cf.* Sickel, Konzil, 586 *seq.*

At the same time as Morone was making these courageous remonstrances, the French government was preparing, by threats of extreme measures, to make the reform of the princes impossible. On August 28th the French envoys were instructed to retire, as a protest, to Venice, and to

---

[1] See SICKEL, Konzil, 588 *seq.*; STEINHERZ, III., 425, where there are details of the steps taken by Delfino with the Emperor, by the command of the legates.

cause the French bishops to leave, as soon as the Council touched upon the rights and liberties of the French crown. The power of the Council, so Charles IX. declared, was exclusively limited to the reform of the ecclesiastical body, and it had no authority to interfere in the affairs and rights of the state.[1]

The legates found themselves in an increasingly critical position, as the majority of the fathers insisted that the whole of the thirty-six articles, including that on the reform of the princes, should be submitted. The conferences on the first twenty-one chapters were begun on September 11th with a speech by Cardinal Guise, who spoke in words of praise of the readiness of the Pope and the legates to promote the work of reform. Among his remarks, his demand for a special decision as to the reform of the Cardinals met with great and almost universal approval.[2] It was found impossible to bring these conferences to an end before the Session fixed for September 16th, and for this reason, as well as on account of the great differences of opinion concerning the sacrament of Matrimony, Morone, at the General Congregation on September 15th, announced to the fathers that the Session appointed for the following day could not be held. His proposal to postpone it to St. Martin's day was accepted against a minority.[3]

On the afternoon of September 15th, the Imperial envoy delivered a letter of the 4th from Ferdinand I., which asked for a further adjournment of the reform of the princes. The legates replied that they could only delay the matter so long as the conferences on the first twenty-one chapters should last.[4]

The treatment of the reform of the princes was impatiently desired by the majority of the bishops, because they knew very well that it was a question of their own authority and independence. The difficult position in which the legates found themselves was further aggravated by the fact that they were not united among themselves. Cardinals Navagero and Hosius insisted so strongly, in the discussions on the sacrament of Matrimony, on their own special wishes, that the speedy close of the Council, so longed for by Morone, was continually delayed. Morone and Simonetta did not themselves agree upon several questions of reform ; Simonetta defended the interests of the Curia and the College of Cardinals more energetically than Morone, against whom Cardinal Farnese in particular expressed his displeasure on this account.[1]

---

[1] See LE PLAT, VI., 194 *seq.;* Lettres de Cath. de Médicis II., 87 *seq.* *Cf.* BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 366.

[2] See THEINER, II., 397 *seqq.* *Cf.* PALEOTTO, *ibid.*, 663 *seq.;* PALLAVICINI, 23, 3; ŠUSTA, IV., 237 *seq.*

[3] See THEINER, II., 406 *seq.;* MENDOÇA, 696 *seq.;* ŠUSTA, IV., 242 *seq.*

[4] See ŠUSTA, IV., 243 *seq.*

On September 16th the General Congregation continued its deliberations on the articles on reform, and the question of the exemption of the chapters especially led to violent discussions. The conferences were brought to a close on October 2nd, by a memorable speech from Lainez,[2] but before this an unexpected occurrence had taken place in the General Congregation of September 22nd.

The legates had been able to report to Rome on September 20th that, on the strength of fresh instructions, the French envoys, du Ferrier and Pibrac, had informed them that their government was pleased that the Council had undertaken the discussion of reform, and disapproved of the arbitrary departure of several of the French bishops from Trent. On this occasion the French envoys had expressed a desire to be allowed to bring forward in the General Congregation several matters concerned with reform, which were in themselves of small importance.[3] The legates made no difficulty about granting this request, and appointed the General Congregation of September 22nd for the purpose. On that occasion, however, du Ferrier made a speech which completely and most painfully surprised the legates. The Frenchman began with a complaint of the delay in ecclesiastical reform, and then at once passed on to what mattered most, the actual plans for reform. He declared that this destroyed the freedom of the Gallican Church, and the authority of His Most Christian Majesty. For centuries, he continued, these monarchs had issued ecclesiastical laws which were in no way contrary to dogma, or injurious to the freedom of the bishops, as the latter were in no way prevented from residing the whole year round in their dioceses, from preaching daily the pure word of God, from leading sober, just and godly lives, and allowing the revenues of the Church to be used for the benefit of the poor! The Most Christian Kings had founded nearly the whole of the churches and had, as rulers of France, the right to dispose freely of the property and revenues of the clergy, as they did of those of their subjects in general, when the well-being and needs of the state required it. Moreover, they possessed this right, this power and authority, not from men but from God, who had given men kings, so that they should obey them. The fathers, therefore, must not do anything against these rights, or against Gallican freedom, otherwise it was his duty to protest, which he now did.[1]

---

[1] See Šusta, IV., 263.

[2] See Theiner, II., 407 *seq.;* Beccadelli, II., 131 ; Mendoça, 698 ; Psalmaeus, 868 *seq.;* Pallavicini, 23, 3.

[3] See Šusta, IV., 255.

This outburst on the part of du Ferrier, the offensive tone of which was still further increased by several ironical expressions, was bound to cause much displeasure to the fathers of the Council, and on the following day was severely condemned by Carlo Grassi. Bishop of Montefiascone.[2] The French bishops were also affected by the general feeling of disgust, the Archbishop of Sens going so far as to declare that du Ferrier intended to urge Charles IX. to follow in the footsteps of Henry VIII.[3] This opinion was shared by

---

[1] See the text of the speech in LE PLAT, IV., 233 *seq.* On the impression it made, see the testimony collected by ŠUSTA, IV., 271. See also MENDOÇA, 697 *seq.*; BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 366 *seq.*

[2] See LE PLAT, VI., 241 *seq.*

[3] See BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 367 n. 2.

Morone, who regarded the situation as very dangerous, and feared a French schism. His principal hope of preventing matters from coming to an extremity lay in Cardinal Guise[1] the latter had not been present at the insulting address of du Ferrier, as he had started on September 18th, in company with several other French prelates and theologians, for his long projected visit to Rome.

Pius IV. received the French Cardinal, who reached Rome on September 29th,[2] with every imaginable sign of honour; Guise had apartments assigned to him in the Vatican, where the Pope paid him a very ceremonial visit.[3] The two discussed all the questions then pending in a long conversation, and with regard to du Ferrier's speech Guise gave the Pope the tranquillizing assurance that the envoy had never been instructed by his king to act in such a manner. In consequence of this, the shrewd Pius IV. ordered the legates on October 2nd to pay no attention to the French protest.[4] The Pope showed the greatest consideration to Cardinal Guise, and a complete understanding between the two was all the more easily reached as the French Cardinal was very glad to be again on good terms with the Pope, both for political and religious reasons.[5] In a consistory on October 8th, Pius IV. bestowed the greatest praise on the Cardinal, expressing at the same time his hope of the speedy ending of the Council.[1] When Guise left Rome on October 19th,[2] Pius IV. and Borromeo sent letters to the legates at Trent, in which, amid many words of praise, the firm conviction was expressed that Guise would be true to his promises. "His interests," the Pope said, "are so closely bound up with ours, that there is no room for doubt." Consequently the legates were instructed to treat the Cardinal on his return to Trent exactly as if he were a legate; the same honour was also to be shown to Cardinal Madruzzo.[3] Guise deserved this confidence, for he indeed returned to Trent with the honest intention of giving his help in the best interests of the Church, so as to bring the Council to a speedy and honourable end.[4]

---

[1] See Šusta, IV., 271 *seq.*

[2] *Report of Giacomo Tarreghetti, dated Rome, October 2, 1563 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] See the reports in Sickel, Konzil, 609 *seq.*; Legaz. di Serristori 392 *seq.*; Giac. Soranzo, 148. *Cf.* Baguenault de Puchesse, 370. The journey of Cardinal Guise to Rome, which, with the mission of Morone to Innsbruck, forms one of the most important events in the third period of the Council, is deserving of treatment in a special monograph. The demands of Guise and the decisions made by Pius IV. with regard to them, are of very great interest; they have been gathered together and published for the first time by Šusta (IV., 339 *seq*).

[4] See the instruction of Borromeo of October 2, 1563, in Šusta, IV., 303 *seq.* *Cf.* Baguenault de Puchesse, 370 *seq.*

[5] See Baguenault de Puchesse, 370 *seq.*

The decisive turn as to this question, which had become more and more heated, had taken place while Guise was still absent in Rome.

However widely the views of the two supreme heads of Christendom might differ on the subject of the Council and reform, there was, nevertheless, one subject which was calculated to bring them together; this was the Papal confirmation of Maximilian's election as King of the Romans, a matter in which the Emperor, who was now growing old, had an extraordinary interest.

Pius IV. had, on many occasions, proved himself to be an exceedingly adroit politician, but never was his skill more clearly shown than in this matter. As soon as Maximilian's election had taken place, on November 24th, 1562, very protracted negotiations had followed. The latest investigations have thrown complete light on these,[5] and have shown why Pius IV. changed from his originally favourable attitude. After Ferdinand I. had plainly shown his desire to influence the Council independently of the Pope, by the delivery of the reform libellum of June 6th, the happy idea came into the mind of Pius IV. to connect the confirmation of Maximilian's election with the Council, that is to say, to obtain Ferdinand's consent to the closure of the Council in exchange for such confirmation.[1] After long and tiresome negotiations, an agreement was at last reached on this basis. The task, as important as it was difficult, of acting as mediator, was undertaken by Delfino, the ambitious nuncio at the Imperial court, who succeeded in solving the question to the satisfaction of Pope and Emperor alike. This decision was reached at the beginning of October.

---

[1] See Arco's report of October 9, 1563, in SICKEL, Konzil, 609; ŠUSTA, IV., 570.

[2] See the *report of G. Tarreghetti, dated Rome, October 20, 1563 (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua).

[3] See ŠUSTA, IV., 337 *seq*.

[4] See the *Relazione sommaria* in the Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., III., 657.

[5] STEINHERZ, in Vol. III., of the Nuntiaturberichte, to whose excellent account in the Introduction p. xlii-xlviii, we must here

On the morning of October 10th, a letter from Delfino to the legates, dated October 4th, arrived in Trent, with the news that the Emperor had agreed that the Council should be closed at the next Session. Two days before this, at the request of almost all the envoys, it had been resolved to postpone the question of the reform of the princes until the following Session.[2] Delfino said that the Emperor had sent his envoys similar instructions, and had also sent them, so as to avoid all delay, a proposal for mediation in the question of ecclesiastical liberties.[3] The contents of this important message was confirmed on the same day by the Imperial envoys. The legates immediately announced the happy tidings to Rome, adding that they were endeavouring to make an alteration in the articles relating to the secular princes, and therefore begged for immediate instructions, which were sent to them as soon as possible.[4]

---

refer, *Ibid.*, 453 *seq.*, for the part taken by Maximilian in the Emperor's decision. The brief of thanks sent to Maximilian on October 22, in BUCHOLTZ, IX., 716.

[1] See STEINHERZ, III., xliii.

[2] See THEINER, II., 423 *seq.*

[3] STEINHERZ, III. 439, *seq.*

[4] ŠUSTA, IV., 305 *seq.*

Great joy was felt in Trent as well as in Rome, at this decision of the Emperor, and the satisfaction of Pius IV. was indescribable. He personally thanked the Imperial ambassador, Arco, and addressed glowing words of gratitude to Maximilian in the consistory on October 15th. On the same day the legates were instructed to hasten the proceedings of the Council as much as possible, and Borromeo wrote a special letter to Morone, telling him to be as active as possible in this sense, without regard for what the Spanish representative might say.[1]

Thanks to the early receipt of the Papal instructions, as well as to the zeal and skill of the legates, among whom Morone especially distinguished himself,[2] the still outstanding difficulties were overcome in a comparatively short time, and it was possible to keep to St. Martin's day as the date for the next Session. The legates, who had constantly to struggle against the Count di Luna's policy of obstruction, had already submitted a new, the fourth, version of the canons and reform decree on the sacrament of Matrimony, on October 13th.[3] As the result of the conferences[4] held on this on October 26th and 27th, the final version of the twelve canons and the ten reform chapters in question was drawn up. A commission of eighteen prelates was appointed to formulate anew the first twenty-one chapters on general reform, and they began their work on October 22nd. The new formula drafted by this commission was laid before the fathers of the Council on October 31st, and these once more discussed it in eleven Congregations, from November 2nd to the 8th. The definite form was decided on November 9th and 10th.[5]

A leading part in this favourable result was taken by Cardinal Guise,[6] who had returned from Rome on November 5th. He was not disheartened by the fact that his endeavours, when passing through Venice, to induce the French envoys who were staying there, to return to Trent, proved vain.[1] The tribute which, in the General Congregation of November 8th, he paid to the zeal of Pius IV. for reform, corresponded to the favourable account of the state of affairs in Rome which the austere Archbishop of Braga, who had also just returned from the Eternal City, had given before his arrival.[2]

---

[1] See Steinherz, III., 465-6; Šusta, IV., 327 *seq.*

[2] *Cf.* Šusta, IV., 375.

[3] See Theiner, II., 424.

[4] *Ibid.*, 427 *seqq.*

[5] See Theiner, II., 429-62; Mendoça, 705 *seq.*

[6] *Cf.* Paleotto in Theiner, II., 673; Pallavicini, 23, 6, 12.

The demand made by a majority of the fathers that a special chapter should undertake the reform of the College of Cardinals, caused great difficulty at the discussions on general reform. Those fathers who opposed this were of opinion that the matter must be left to the decision of the Pope. It is easy to understand that such a demand naturally caused great excitement in the Curia; both the Farnese Cardinals wrote in the sense of the whole Sacred College to Morone blaming him strongly for having allowed the Curia and the College of Cardinals to be burdened with the very strictest of reforms while the princes escaped altogether. Morone, whose own elevation had been due to the Farnese Pope, answered frankly, justifying his conduct on the ground of necessity, but deprecating exaggerated alarm.[3] The opposition of the influential Farnese, however, increased the dissensions at Trent as to how this matter was to be decided, for it was extremely difficult to hit upon the true mean between the two extremes. Eventually Morone found a solution; he associated the reform of the Cardinals with that of the bishops, and it might easily be taken for granted that the latter would avoid anything like exaggerated severity in their own affairs. Besides this a still graver danger would be avoided by Morone's conciliatory proposal, namely that of fresh discussions on the mutual relations of the Pope and the Council.[4]

---

[1] See BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE 370.

[2] See THEINER, II., 440, 457; PALLAVICINI, 23, 7, 7 and 9; ŠUSTA IV. 367.

[3] See PALLAVICINI, 23, 7; SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen 171 *seq.*

[4] See the *Relazione sommaria* in the Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch, III., 657; SÄGMÜLLER, *loc. cit.*, 174.

All those who did not possess the right to vote were excluded from the last General Congregation on November 10th, to which all the canons and decrees were once again submitted; in previous General Congregations the more important theologians had been admitted. The canons and decrees on the sacrament of Matrimony were first brought forward, and before proceeding to the consideration of the decrees on discipline, the resolution was adopted to add to all decrees the clause: "in everything and always without prejudice to the authority of the Holy See." All questions submitted, including the declaration of the right of proposition, in the twenty-first chapter of the reform decree, were almost unanimously accepted.[1]

After the happy issue of these preliminary proceedings, the XXIVth Session, the eighth under Pius IV., was held on November 11th, 1563.[2] There were present the four legates, Cardinals Guise and Madruzzo, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, a hundred and eighty-six bishops, five abbots, six generals of orders, and eleven envoys. High Mass was celebrated by an Italian, Cornaro, Bishop of Treviso, and the sermon preached by a Frenchman, Richardot, Bishop of Arras. The doctrinal chapter on Matrimony, in twelve canons, and the reform decree on the same subject, in twelve chapters, were first submitted. The first of these chapters declared clandestine marriages null and void; for the valid celebration of marriage, the presence of the parish priest, or, with his permission or that of the ordinary, of another priest, and of two or three witnesses, were necessary. In the chapters that followed there were regulations concerning the impediments to matrimony, which were in some ways limited, the punishment of those who abducted women, the marriages of *vagi*, laws against concubinage, or violations of the freedom of the marriage contract, and finally regulations concerning the forbidden times. While a section of the fathers violently opposed a good number of the regulations, the majority accepted these decrees. Then followed the reform decree, in twenty chapters. It contained useful regulations as to the nomination to bishoprics, and the appointment of Cardinals, the holding of provincial and diocesan synods, the visitation of dioceses, the exercise of the office of preaching, legal procedure against bishops, the extension of the dispensing power of the bishops, the instruction of the people on the sacraments and the Mass, public penances and the office of penitentiary, the visitation of exempted churches, the juridical import of titles of honour, the qualities and duties of cathedral officials, the accumulation of several benefices, the constitution of regular parochial deaneries, the keeping intact of beneficiary goods, the benefices of cathedral and collegiate churches, the administration of dioceses during a vacancy in the see, the abolition of the union of several benefices in one person, if the obligations connected therewith entailed the duty of residence, the prohibition of expectancies, provisions, reservations, and other similar privileges in the case of vacant benefices, on the manner of appointment to vacant parishes, and ecclesiastical procedure at law. A special decree was added to this which gave the following explanation of the much discussed right of proposition: "As the council desires that its decrees may leave no room for doubt in the future, it explains the words contained in the decree published in the first Session under Pius IV., namely that the Council shall, *proponentibus legatis*, deal with such subjects as shall seem suitable to end religious controversies, to set a bridle on evil tongues, and to reform the abuses of corrupt customs, by declaring that it has not had the intention, by the words in question, of changing the usual manner of dealing with affairs in General Councils, nor of investing thereby anyone with a new right, or of withdrawing any which may already exist."[1]

---

[1] See PALLAVICINI 24, 2.

[2] See THEINER, II., 463-5; PALEOTTO, *ibid.*, 674 *seq.*; RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 193-6; PALLAVICINI, 23, 8 *seq.*; BECCADELLI, Monumenti, II., 149; ŠUSTA, IV., 379 *seq.*

---

[1] See PALLAVICINI, 23, 10-12; KNÖPFLER in the Freiburger Kirchenlex., XI², 2109. Luna too was in the end satisfied with the aforesaid declaration (see the report of the legates of November 8, 1563, in ŠUSTA, IV., 367). Pius IV. was very

At the voting on the reform decree so many divergent votes were given in the case of chapters III., V., and VI., that after the Session these had to be once more referred to the commission appointed for the drawing up of the decree, and it was only on December 3rd that it was possible to publish it in the amended form decided upon between November 12th and 15th.[1] The eighth Session had begun at half past nine in the morning, and had lasted until half past seven in the evening.

With general consent the next Session was fixed for December 9th, with the power, if necessary, to anticipate that date. The still undecided chapter on the exemptions of cathedral chapters, as well as other questions of reform which had not yet been dealt with, were to be treated in this Session. Pius IV. sanctioned all the decrees of the XXIVth Session, and addressed letters of thanks to the persons principally concerned, at the same time urging the speedy end of the Council.[2]

The legates were in no need of any such exhortation. Supported by the wish of Ferdinand I., Maximilian II., the Kings of Portugal and Poland, the Republic of Venice and the other Italian governments, they did their utmost, in spite of the opposition of di Luna, to bring about a successful conclusion of the Council. Morone, above all, undisturbed by calumnies and enmity, worked for this end.[3] He succeeded in finding a way out of the difficult question of the exemption of the cathedral chapters; that great abuses existed in this matter was undeniable, but the desire of Philip II. to have them removed was by no means disinterested. He wished to have the power of the chapters limited as much as possible, principally because his influence, which in consequence of the royal

---

pleased that the affair had been settled by a synodal decree and not by a brief (see PALLAVICINI, 24, 2, 1). As to the faculties granted to the bishops see MERGENTHEIM, I., 84 *seq.*

[1] See THEINER, II., 475-6.

[2] PALLAVICINI, 24, 2.

[3] RANKE (Päpste, I⁶., 222) is of opinion: "The Catholic Church owes to him, rather than to anyone else, the happy issue of the Council."

bestowal of the bishoprics was already very considerable, would thereby be much increased. The Pope was obliged to resist this, so he and the legates espoused the cause of the chapters. On account of the dependence of the Spanish bishops on their government there was reason to fear that they might allow themselves to be led by the will of Philip II., if the votes were taken by word of mouth. The legates therefore resolved that on this occasion the votes should be made in writing, and in this manner they gained an important majority for the chapters. Guise skilfully mediated with the Spanish bishops, who were now satisfied to accept a much less extensive amplification of their faculties.[1]

On November 13th Morone summoned the legates, Cardinals Guise and Madruzzo, as well as twenty-five other prelates of different nations, to a meeting, and impressed upon them the necessity of bringing the Council to a close with the next Session. Guise also spoke urgently in favour of a conclusion, painting in strong colours the dangerous state of France, and alluding to the national council which was threatened there. The Bishops of Lerida and Leon were alone in wishing that the King of Spain should first give his consent. The Archbishop of Granada, on the other hand, was unconditionally in favour of the closing of the Council. The dangers arising from the possible decease of the Pope or the Emperor, and the inconveniences which had arisen from the long absence of the bishops from their dioceses, were urgent reasons in favour of this view. It was, therefore, resolved to resume the discussion of the reform decrees already submitted. With regard to the reform of the princes they approached the task with great moderation, as the secular power would very soon be required for the enforcement of the decrees. They therefore adopted that formulation of the decree, as to which the Pope had come to an agreement with the Emperor. In this the prescriptions of earlier Councils and canons were merely renewed, the anathemas being replaced by paternal admonitions.[1] With regard to the questions of dogma which were still in arrears, such as the doctrines of Purgatory, indulgences, the invocation of the saints, and the veneration of their images and relics, it was only necessary to gather together all that had been decided in former Councils, in such a way as to remove abuses, but without entering upon discussions. On account of the general feeling of weariness even the envoys of the princes agreed to this procedure.[2]

---

[1] See the *Relatione sommaria* in the Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch., III., 657; RANKE, Päpste, I^6., 224. *Cf.* also MENDOÇA, 705 *seq.*; SICKEL, Konzil, 636 *seq.*; PALLAVICINI, 24, 4, 11.

The decisions arrived at on November 13th were laid by Morone before the General Congregation two days later, and the remaining fourteen chapters of the reform decree were then discussed. As the last one, that on the reform of the princes, had been given a very mild and elastic form, it was necessary that ecclesiastical reform should be modified as well.[3]

The discussions upon this lasted from November 15th to the 18th, on which date the six other reform chapters were submitted.[1] To these, on November 20th, was added a decree upon the reform of the regulars, which was discussed from November 23rd to the 25th.[2]

---

[1] Šusta, IV., 326 *seq.*

[2] See Paleotto in Theiner, II., 675 *seq.*; Mendoça, 711 *seq.*; Pallavicini, 24, 2, 3; Baguenault de Puchesse, 384; Šusta, IV., 385 *seq.*

[3] "That the reform of the laity should thus have failed," such is the verdict of Sägmüller (Papstwahlbullen, 181), "cannot be imputed to Pius IV. We should rather recognize in it his great prudence and his practical grasp of the whole state of affairs at that time. Nor can it be regarded as so great a mistake that the reform of the Curia turned out to be milder than was somewhat unwisely desired in certain quarters, for, in the great uplifting of the Catholic Church which followed upon the Council of Trent, Rome maintained her position as the leader in this matter. And if, in the failure of the reform of the laity, no decision was arrived at in the matter of the interference of the princes in the Papal elections, and consequently there was no express prohibition of such a thing, yet this had already been provided against in another way, namely in Par. 26 of the bull *In eligendis*." (October 9, 1562).

On November 27th the Spanish envoy made a protest against these steps for bringing the Council to such a hurried close, whereupon Morone again summoned a special meeting at his residence on November 28th; all present again spoke unanimously in favour of closing the Council. The Archbishop of Granada was alone in demanding that, fifteen days after the coming Session, yet another should be held. The majority of the fathers would not agree to this, but determined to prepare the dogmatic questions already mentioned for the Session appointed for December 9th.[3]

On November 16th Hosius had informed Commendone that the hopes of a successful ending of the Council had never been so great as they were at present. Cardinal Guise urged haste, and threatened that if the proceedings were drawn out till Christmas he and all the French bishops would leave Trent. The envoys of the Emperor and the other princes were similarly insistent, so that, unless something unexpected should occur, the desired goal seemed likely to be reached in a very short time.[4]

---

[1] See Theiner, II., 480 *seq.*; Mendoça, 712 *seq.*; Pallavicini, 24, 3.

[2] See Theiner, II., 4,5 *seq.*; Mendoça, 713 *seq.*

[3] See Paleotto in Theiner, II., 67,, *seq.*; Mendoça, 716; Pallavicini, 24, 4; Šusta, IV., 415 *seq.*, 420 *seq.*

[4] *Nunquam spe fuimus maiore celerius absolvendi concilii quam nunc. Urget Lotaringius cardinalis, ac si fuerit extractum ad natalem usque christianum, se cum suis omnibus Gallorum episcopis discessurum hinc minatur, nullus ut ex eis adfuturus sit. Quomodo concilii decretis erit subscribendum; quae res non mediocre nobis calcar addidit ad festinandum, nam si prius Galli discederent quam esset concilium absolutm, dubitari posset num esset oecumenicum. Urgent autem hoc ipsum et Caes. M^{tis} oratores, quibus etiam alii non dissentiunt. Itaquo nisi quid evenerit ex improviso, videmur iam optatum concilii finem esse brevi consequuturi, quem ut faustum ecclesiae suae Deus esse velit, supplex maiestatem eius imploro. Hosius to Commendone,

The unexpected, however, did occur. On November 29th and 30th the representative of Philip II., the Count di Luna, summoned the Spanish bishops, and such Italians as were subject to Spanish rule, to his house, in order to bring about, through their means, a prolongation of the Council. Only two or three of those who appeared, however, shared the views of the envoy.[1] The last of these meetings finished at seven o'clock in the evening. Two hours later, a courier, sent from Rome by the Spanish ambassador, Requesens, arrived at di Luna's house with the news that the Pope was mortally ill. Soon afterwards Morone and Simonetta received a letter from Cardinal Borromeo, dated November 27th, telling of the grave illness of the Pope, accompanied by a certified statement from the physicians. A postscript announced the very urgent wish of Pius IV. that the closing of the Council should be hurried on in every possible way.[2] Haste was absolutely necessary, for a schism was to be feared, on account of the mutual dispute between the Council and the Cardinals in Rome concerning the right of electing a new Pope; not only were the legates convinced of this, but also Guise and Madruzzo.[3] The legates, therefore, immediately summoned the envoys and the most important prelates, in order to lay the threatened danger before them. All, with the exception of the representatives of Philip II. and several of the Spaniards, declared themselves agreeable to the last Session of the Council being held at once, and a special meeting of the prelates, summoned on December 2nd, also agreed to this. A General Congregation was held on the same day, which, with the utmost speed, prepared the whole of the material waiting for publication. On account

---

dated Trent, November 16, 1563 (Graziani Archives, Città di Castello).

[1] See Paleotto in THEINER, II., 678; MENDOÇA, 716; PALLAVICINI, 24, 4; ŠUSTA, IV., 415 *seq.*, 420 *seq.*

[2] See ŠUSTA, IV., 431 *seq.*

[3] *Cf.* the retrospect in the *letter of Hosius to Commendone, dated Trent, December 7, 1563 (Graziani Archives, Città di Castello).

of the great number of subjects, the sitting had to last for two days, and was held on December 3rd and 4th. It was also expressly resolved that the legates should afterwards seek the confirmation of the Pope in the name of the whole Council.[1] During the night better news arrived as to the Pope's condition,[2] but the legates and deputies adhered to the resolution they had taken, and worked until midnight to clear away and settle the last difficulties which had been raised against some of the decrees, partly by the envoys and partly by the fathers.[3]

On the morning of December 3rd, the XXVth and last Session of the Council, the ninth under Pius IV., was opened.[4] High Mass was celebrated by Zambeccaro, Bishop of Sulmona, and the sermon was preached by Girolamo Ragazzoni, Bishop of Nazianzen and coadjutor of Famagosta. The decrees on Purgatory, the invocation of the Saints, and the veneration of their relics and images, were read and almost unanimously accepted. The same was done with the decree on the reform of the regulars, the twenty-two chapters of which contained regulations on the observance of the rules of the orders, the property of communities as well as of individuals, the number of the members, the foundation of monasteries, the enclosure of convents of nuns, the election of superiors, the visitation of convents, whether exempt or non-exempt, the confessions of nuns, the exercise of the cure of souls by regulars, the settlement of suits, criminal procedure, vows and novices, freedom of entry, the treatment of "apostates" and benefices held in commendam. With regard to these last, some of the fathers wished that they should be entirely abolished, but Guise had already prevented this in the General Congregation.

---

[1] See Paleotto in THEINER, II., 678 *seq.;* MENDOÇA, 717; PALLAVICINI, 24, 4; ŠUSTA, IV., 434 *seq.*, 437 *seq.*

[2] The opinion that the illness of Pius IV. was an invention, or purposely exaggerated, is untenable (see SÄGMÜLLER, Papstwahlbullen, 177). To the evidence already printed (*cf.* SICKEL, Konzil, 643 *seq.* Corpo dipl. Portug., X., 154) may be added the statements of the Mantuan ambassador, Giacomo Tarreghetti, who wrote on December 1: *Dopo che io scrissi l' altra mia a V. Ecc^a^, N.S. è stato grandemente oppresso dal male, non senza grandissimo pericolo di vita, per quello si diceva publicamente, imperoche ad un tratto era tormento dalla podagra et similmente dal catarro et anco dalla febre. His *report of December 4, 1563 (*cf.* ŠUSTA, IV., 449 *seq*, 454) announces an improvement. According to a *letter of December 8, the Pope on that day was free from fever, and again granted audiences (Gonzaga Archives, Mantua). Serristori, too, in his *letter of December 3, 1563, notes that at first Pius IV. had been considered to be in a hopeless condition by the physicians and everybody else (State Archives, Florence).

[3] See PALLAVICINI, 24, 5.

[4] See THEINER, II., 502-14; RAYNALDUS, 1563, n. 209-17; PSALMAEUS, 876 *seq.;* PALLAVICINI, 24, 5-8; BAGUENAULT DE PUCHESSE, 391 *seq.;* KNÖPFLER, in the Freiburger Kirchenlex., XI^2., 2111 *seq.;* ŠUSTA, IV., 441 *seqq.*

The general reform decree comprised the most various subjects in twenty chapters. It insisted on simplicity in the houses of the bishops and also of the Cardinals, recommended caution in imposing the sentence of excommunication, made rules as to the profession of faith to be made by prelates and other ecclesiastical officials, as well as the professors in Catholic universities, foundations for masses, the visitation of exempted chapters, the abolition of expectancies of ecclesiastical benefices, the administration of hospitals, the right of patronage, the settlement of lawsuits, the lease of ecclesiastical property, the payment of tithes, burial fees, the administration of benefices entailing the cure of souls, and the punishment of clerical concubinage. The nineteenth chapter pronounced excommunication on duellists, their seconds and supporters, and forbade Christian burial to those who fell in a duel. Even the onlookers at a duel were subjected to excommunication. There next followed, as the twentieth chapter, a "strong exhortation to all the princes to maintain and protect the rights and immunities of the Church." In this respect all the earlier canons and constitutions were renewed, and the princes were exhorted to make it possible for the bishops to reside in their dioceses in peace and dignity. The twenty-first and last chapter contained the clause that the authority of the Apostolic See must be held inviolate against all the decisions of the Council. The acceptance of the reform decree took place with an almost miraculous unanimity; it was only with regard to the last two chapters that some remarks were made. After it had lasted from eight o'clock in the morning until nearly five in the evening, the Session, as had been previously arranged in the General Congregation, was adjourned till the following day. Besides the four legates, there were present the two Cardinals, twenty-five archbishops, a hundred and fifty bishops, seven abbots, seven generals of orders, and eleven envoys of the princes.

After the Session, a large majority, among whom was Guise, expressed a wish for a decree on indulgences. Morone was opposed to this as he feared a further delay in concluding the Council, as well as undue precipitancy in the matter, but he was forced at last to yield to the general desire. A decree on indulgences was framed during the night on the basis of the previous discussions, and this was presented very early on December 4th to a General Congregation, in spite of further opposition on the part of Morone.[1] Then they repaired to the Cathedral, where the Archbishop of Catania celebrated High Mass, after which, before anything else, the decree on indulgences was read. This declared that indulgences were salutary and that the Church had the power to grant them; the abuses committed by the collectors of money for indulgences was met by a regulation which very strictly forbade all manner of gain in the matter. With regard to the other abuses in the matter of indulgences, which on account of their multiplicity were not specifically mentioned, the bishops were to discuss these in the provincial synods, and to refer them to the Pope in order that he might remove them. The next decree dealt with the observance of fast and feast days; another dealt with the publication of the Index, the catechism, the breviary and the missal, these latter matters being referred to the Pope. Then the Council declared that from the regulations as to the order of precedence observed among the envoys on this occasion, no one could claim any rights, while at the same time the rights of no one were impugned. Finally a decree was read concerning the observance and acceptance of the Council's decisions.

---

[1] See THEINER, II., 680.

After the decrees had been approved, they proceeded to read once more all the decisions of the preceding Sessions. Finally the fathers were again asked whether they approved of the closure of the Council, and the confirmation of its decrees by the Pope. All gave their assent, the Archbishop of Granada alone declaring the Papal confirmation to be unnecessary. With the words "Andate in pace," the first president, Morone, declared the Council closed. The decrees were confirmed by the signature of two hundred and fifty-five fathers: four Cardinal legates, two cardinals, three patriarchs, twenty-five archbishops, a hundred and sixty-eight bishops, seven abbots, thirty-nine proxies for those who were absent, and seven generals of orders.[1]

When the acclamations, led by Cardinal Guise after the manner of ancient Councils, resounded through the Cathedral of Trent and proclaimed the conclusion of the great work, many of the fathers of the Council could not restrain their tears.[2] They were all affected by the solemnity of the moment, for they felt that the hand of God had turned over a page in the history of His Church.

---

[1] See PALLAVICINI, 24, 8, 13. *Cf.* THEINER, II., 509-13. For the signatures see EHSES in the Abhandlungen der Görres-Gesellschaft, Jahresbericht fur 1917, p. 50.

[2] See Paleotto in THEINER, II., 680; MENDOÇA, 719.

CHAPTER XI

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

In spite of all the disturbances, both from within and from without, in spite of all the delays and obstructions, as well as the many human weaknesses which had come to light during the course of its proceedings, the Council had accomplished a mighty work, and one of decisive importance.[1]

It was true that in spite of every effort, no restoration had been effected at Trent of that unity of faith, on account of which from the first the Council had been so ardently longed for, although there had been no lack on its part of invitations to the followers of the new beliefs. "We have," said the preacher at the Session of December 4th, "chosen this city, at the entrance into Germany, on the very threshold, so to speak, of their house, in order to remove all suspicion from their minds, we have refused to be guarded by troops, we have issued letters of safe-conduct which they themselves have framed, we have waited long for them, we have begged and implored them to come and gain knowledge from the light of the truth." But in the end the hand that had been stretched out had been rejected in the most scornful manner; the last hope of coming to an understanding had failed, the breach was now complete. It was necessary to grow accustomed to the thought that the unity of the family of the Christian nations, that most precious heritage of the middle ages, had been for ever broken, and that a new epoch had begun.

---

[1] *Cf.* H. Swoboda, Das Konzil von Trient, sein Schauplatz, Verlauf und Ertrag, Vienna, 1912. Here E. Tomek (p. 53 *seqq.*) has treated of the Council as the landmark in the history of dogma; J. Lehner (p. 67 *seqq.*) works out in the discussions the things relating to the Holy Eucharist, and F. M. Schindler (p. 79 *seqq.*) the Christian ideal of life; the editor (p. 87 *seqq.*) gives an appreciation of the pastoral spirit of the Council, and F. Zehntbauer (p. 103 *seqq.*) of the decrees on canon law. There is nothing further in the work of P. Deslandres, Le concile de Trente et la réforme du clergé catholique, Paris, 1909. For the medal struck by Pius IV. to commemorate the Council, see Bonanni, I., 275.

However painful this outlook may have been, the breach had brought with it, on the other hand, that clearing up of the religious position which had so long been needed. There could no longer be any doubt as to what was Catholic and what was not, and that religious uncertainty, which had confused the understanding of so many Catholics, and had paralysed so much activity, was now at an end. "This is the belief of us all, this is our unanimous conviction, to which, in token of our agreement and acceptance, we now sign our names. This is the faith of St. Peter and the apostles, this is the faith of the fathers and of all true believers." Thus, after the reading of the decrees of the Council, had Cardinal Guise exclaimed, in the midst of the acclamations at the last Session, and in the full consciousness that their agreement would be handed down, and renewed again and again, to the uttermost bounds of the earth, and to the end of time, the fathers had unanimously answered: "So do we believe, so do we judge, so do we append our names." Error had been judged, the old consciousness of the faith had found a new and exact expression, simple in its form, and definite in its facts.

The "purity of the Gospel" which was always on the lips of the adherents of the new faith, formed the starting point for the Council's pronouncements. For the assembled bishops, however, there could be no question of bringing the "pure Gospel" out of a hiding place where it had lain concealed during more than a thousands years of oblivion; for them it was but a question of preserving the purity of the old and never-forgotten doctrines of Christ, by the removal of error. To them, moreover, the Gospel was not only that which had been written down by the evangelists and apostles, but all that had been preached by Christ and the apostles, and had been handed down by the Church over and above the Holy Scriptures. The first and fundamental error of the innovators, that the Holy Scriptures are the exclusive source of faith, is thus rejected. After having decided which books belong to the Holy Scriptures, they replied to that other fundamental principle of Protestantism, the claim for private judgment, by the decision that no one shall be permitted to oppose his own opinions to that of the whole Church.[1]

Thus, in the first dogmatic decrees, the principal question which divided the old and the new beliefs was touched upon, in that the differences which divided them lay not only in the actual dogmas which were accepted or rejected, but much more in the reason why each article of belief was accepted or rejected, and in the difference of opinion as to the sources of faith, and the standpoint which the individual had to take up with regard to them.

But the Council also had to instruct the faithful in the particular distinctive doctrines, or at least in those which were most important. Here again attention was directed in the first place to those errors which formed the foundation of the doctrinal teaching of the new system of belief, the doctrines of original sin and justification. This subject was of the utmost importance, not only for the faith, but also for the Christian life. Consequences of the most far-reaching importance might result, should such doctrines make their way among the masses of the people, as that the will of man is not free, and is purely passive as regards the matter of salvation, or that good works have no value for salvation.[2] On the other hand it was by no means easy to give precise and satisfactory expression, from every point of view, to the principles living in the consciousness of faith in the Church, as to the manner of justification. There were no decisions of former Councils upon which it was possible to lean ; the older theologians had made scarcely any pronouncements as to justification,[1] while the polemical writings of Catholic scholars of later times were to some extent tainted by the error of double justice. Thus the Council was in this faced by its most difficult task; it accomplished it brilliantly, and to the complete satisfaction of all the fathers of the Council, after arduous labours which occupied seven months of its time.[2]

---

[1] Sess. 4. *Cf*. Vol. XII. of this work, p. 258 *seqq*.

[2] The Tridentine decree on Justification " ought to be regarded with gratitude, not only by the pastoral theologian, but also by anyone who still retains any feeling for moral freedom, and for the ideals of human dignity." SWOBODA, 91.

The doctrine of the Sacraments, by means of which justification is granted, increased, and restored, forms the subject of the decisions of the Sessions that follow, from the VIIth to the XXIVth inclusively. The doctrine of the Eucharist as a sacrament is treated in an especially detailed manner in the XIIIth, and in connection therewith that of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass in the XXIInd Session. In the VIIth Session, in which the sacraments in general, with baptism and confirmation, were dealt with, the Council was content with rejecting the errors of the innovators in short propositions. With the next dogmatic decision, in the XIIIth Session, it reverted to the procedure adopted in the VIth Session, namely, that the Catholic doctrine should first be systematically set forth, with proofs, and only then were the errors opposed to it condemned in short canons. The fathers of the Council had the great advantage when making decrees on the sacraments, that the subject had already been exhaustively discussed by the scholastic theologians. Where the opinions of the scholastics were not in agreement, the question was either evaded or left open, as not yet being ripe for a decision, or else not of importance to the faith. The XXVth and last Session simply promulgates some decrees, partly dogmatic, on Purgatory, the cultus of the saints, relics, images and indulgences.

---

[1] "In eo [articulo de peccato originali] habebamus et sancta concilia et multa sanctorum Patrum dicta. . . . At in articulo de iustificatione nihil tale habemus, sed *primi sumus*, qui isto modo materiam istam aggredimur" (Pacheco in MERKLE, I., 82); *cf.* CARD. CERVINI, *ibid.*, 81, and EHSES, II., 257; PALLAVICINI, 8, 2, 2. JOS. HEFNER, Die Enstehungsgesch. des Trienter Rechtfertigungsdekretes, Paderborn, 1909. ST. EHSES, Zwei Trienter Konzilsvota (Seripando and Salmeron), 1546. ISIDOR CLARIUS in the Röm. Quartalschrift, XXVII. (1913) 20 **seqq.*, 129 *seqq.* HEFNER, Voten (di Is. Clarius) vom Trienter Konzil, Würzburg, 1912 (*cf.* EHSES, *loc. cit.*, 25 **seq.*). The origin of the decree on original sin is treated by W. KOCH in Tübingen Quartalsch. XCV. (1913), 430 *seq.*, and F. CAVALLERA in the Bulletin de littérature ecclés., 1913, 241 *seq.*; on that of the reform decree on preaching, see J. E. RAINER, in Zeitschr. für kath. Theol., XXXIX (1915), 256 *seq.* EHSES (V., xiv. n. 3) gives for the first time a satisfactory explanation of the absence of the clause relating to the Immaculate Conception in several of the earliest impressions of the decree; *cf.* also CAVALLERA in Recherches de science relig., IV. (1913), 270 *seqq.*

[2] *Cf.* Vol. XII. of this work, p. 337 *seq.*

No formal, definitive, decision was pronounced at Trent with regard to a very important doctrine: that of the primacy of the Roman See. The Council, however, often calls the Roman Church the mother and mistress of all the churches;[1] it ordered that at the acceptance of the Council's decisions at each of the provincial synods, and at the reception of any ecclesiastical dignity, all must promise true obedience to the Pope.[2] The Council also ordained that its decrees should only have force subject to the maintenance of the rights of the Roman See.[3] It recognized that the Pope, in virtue of his office, has to care for the whole Church,[4] and that it fell to him to provide for the holding of an ecumenical Council.[5]

---

[1] Si quis dixerit in ecclesia Romana, quae omnium ecclesiarum mater est et magistra, non esse veram de baptismi sacramento doctrinam: anathema sit., Sess. 7, de baptismo, can. 3. *Cf.* Sess. 14, de extr. unctione c. 3; sess. 25, de delectu ciborum; sess, 22, doctrina de sacrif. missae c. 8. *Cf.* the Professio fidei Tridentinae.

[2] Sess. 25, de ref. c. 2; *cf.* sess. 24 c. 12.

[3] Sess. 25, de ref. c. 21; *cf.* sess. 7, de ref. Prooem.

[4] Sollicitudinem universae ecclesiae ex muneris sui officio debet. Sess. 24, de ref. c. 1; *cf.* sess. 14, de poenit, c. 7: Pontifices maximi pro suprema potestate sibi in ecclesia universa tradita causas aliquas . . . suo potuerunt peculiari iudicio reservare.

[5] The difficulties which might arise in the acceptance or carrying into effect of the conciliar decrees, would be overcome, so the Council hoped, by the Pope "vel etiam concilii generalis celebratione, si necessarium iudicaverit." Sess. 25 Contin., De recipiendis et observandis decretis concilii.

Finally the Council recognized, *de facto*, the primacy of the Pope by submitting, in the last of its decrees, the decisions arrived at to Papal confirmation.

The denial of the Papal supremacy on the part of the innovators was sufficiently answered by these decisions, but Gallican views as to the primacy, and especially the question whether the Pope was subject to an ecumenical Council, were not expressly decided at Trent. On account of the uncertainty of the religious position in France, it was to be feared that a formal condemnation of this doctrine, the evil inheritance of the XVth Century, might give rise to a schism.[1]

As regards everything else, the " most important " doctrines of the innovators[2] were condemned by the Council. The old Church, which had been defamed and said to be dead, had proved her vitality in a striking and most efficacious manner. If Luther had attained to great success, through his superiority as a writer endowed with a great command of language, the discussions and decrees of the Council at Trent displayed a superiority of another kind, the superiority of ripe theological science, penetrating discernment, and a deep understanding of the coherence of Christian doctrine.

The reform decrees of the Council are no less striking a testimony to the spirit and strength of the old Church. She had been attacked in every way, in word, in writing, and in picture ; she had been represented as the kingdom of Anti-Christ, and the sink of iniquity, but behold ! the calumniated Church had risen again, and her very rising was a proof that the spirit of Paul and Elias was still alive in her.

---

[1] Later on, in the times of Louis XIV. and Joseph II., they likewise could not appeal to a conciliar decision against the obscuring of the doctrine of the faith on this point. To the great detriment of the Church the ideas of the time of the Council of Basle could therefore continue to flourish, and the Church to be disturbed by Gallicanism, Febronianism and lastly by the school of Döllinger.

[2] Sancta synodus id potissimum curavit, ut praecipuos haereti corum nostri temporis errores damnaret. Sess. 25 Contin., de recip. et observ. decr.

The abuses with which the Church had so often been reproached are neither denied nor extenuated in the reform decrees. The very first sentence of the first decree candidly acknowledges that ecclesiastical discipline had become greatly relaxed, and that the morality of both clergy and people was at a low ebb.[1] Nevertheless, the fathers, with a holy earnestness and zeal, which stand out in every decree, and, so to speak, in every sentence, set themselves to stop this depravity, and to restore the original purity in every respect. It was not enough for them to attack merely the grossest abominations, but with a high idealism, which can only be explained by the consciousness that the true Church of Christ has divine powers at her disposal, which need but to be awakened to cause everything to blossom forth again in all its former beauty, they fixed their hopes on the highest aims. They would lend no ear to the advice that they should meet at least the worst excesses of a depraved clergy by allowing the marriage of priests.[2] They do not shrink from reminding the worldly prelates of a precept of the first centuries of the Church, according to which the table and household of a bishop must be simple and moderate;[3] they lay it down as a principle that only they should be consecrated as bishops whose lives, from boyhood to mature age, have been spent in the praiseworthy exercises of ecclesiastical duties,[4] who are filled with the knowledge that they are chosen, not for their own benefit, not for riches or luxury, but to work and to suffer for the honour of God.[5] The same requirements were also extended to the Cardinals.[6]

The whole reform plan of the fathers of the Council is built upon the conviction that the Church, in her organization, possesses both the possibility and the means of moral rejuvenation. According to their idea, the bishops are the chosen representatives of the reform, from which must proceed the whole of the new life. Consequently, the fathers began their work of reform with themselves, for the integrity of those who are in authority, in the words of Leo the Great, is the salvation of those who are subject.[1]

---

[1] [Synodus] ad restituendam collapsam admodum ecclesiasticam disciplinam depravatosque in clero et populo christiano mores emendandos se accingere volens. Sess. 6, de ref, c. I.

[2] *Cf.* sess. 24, can. 9.

[3] Sess. 25, 2. I. In the notes that follow the reference is in each case to the decree on reform.

[4] Sess. 6, c. I.

[5] Sess. 25, c. I.

[6] *Ibid.* and sess. 24, c. I.

At the beginning of the exhortations to the bishops stands a requirement, concerning the nature of and reason for which such violent disputes had arisen, the requirement that the bishop must not remain away from his own flock.[2] The residence of the bishops appeared so important to the fathers, that in the introduction to the reform decree of the VIIth Session, they at once speak of the business begun " concerning residence and reform,"[3] and towards the end of the Council they once more return to the duty of residence of the bishops,[4] as if all the evils in the Church proceeded from the neglect of this. Since the shepherd must remain with his flock, he must not have several bishoprics in his possession, for " he is to be esteemed fortunate to whom it is given to rule even one church well and fruitfully."[5] The bishop must devote his whole strength to one diocese alone, he must build it up by his care for religious instruction, in the preaching which is the principal duty of bishops,[6] by constant visitation,[7] the punishment of the guilty,[8] and by his care to have a good clergy.[9]

But, on the other hand, the bishop must have the greatest possible freedom in the administration of his diocese. No privilege shall, for the future, protect the guilty cleric from his power of inflicting punishment ;[1] against his visitation not even the cathedral chapters have the right to claim exemption.[2] At his visitations he has the right to arrange matters as he thinks fit,[3] and should his power not prove sufficient in special cases, he may then act in the name of the Pope, and as his representative.[4] Care shall also be taken that the accused shall not tie the hands of justice by appeals and similar practices.[5] The bishop is specially urged[6] to take care of the poor and needy, as his government must in general bear the stamp of gentleness.[7] The bishop should summon his clergy to a joint conference every year in a diocesan synod, while the metropolitans shall every three years hold a provincial synod.[8]

---

[1] Sess. 6, c. 1.

[2] Sess. 6, c. 1.

[3] inceptum residentiae et reformationis negotium.

[4] Sess. 23, c. 1.

[5] Sess. 7, c. 2.

[6] Sess. 5. c. 2.

[7] Sess. 6, c. 7 *seq.;* sess. 24, c. 3 etc.

[8] Sess. 13, c. 1 *seqq.*

[9] Sess. 23 c. 18.

Above all things, however, the bishops must take care to have an able and worthy clergy. For the world in general, the Council states, nothing is in a higher degree a constant lesson in piety and the service of God, than the life and example of those who are dedicated to the divine service. All look to them and regulate their conduct by their example. In their dress, their bearing and their speech, clerics must show themselves filled with the spirit of religion, so they must avoid even light sins, which in their case are very grave ;[9] they must take the lead of the people in their manner of life, their conversation, and in their learning.[10] Parish priests should preach every Sunday and festival, and they must be specially careful about the instruction of the children in Christian doctrine.[11]

All those who have the cure of souls are earnestly reminded of their duty of residing among their flocks.[1] The bishop can suspend incapable clerics,[2] ignorant parish priests must have a coadjutor, and the immoral must be punished.[3] A number of regulations aim at preventing unworthy persons from receiving Holy Orders,[4] above all, no one may be ordained, or receive a benefice, without having passed an examination ;[5] a certificate of good conduct from the parish priest is necessary before receiving minor orders, and only step by step, and after long proof and trial in the lower ranks, shall anyone be promoted to the priesthood.[6] Even more important than all these regulations for the prevention of unworthy persons being admitted into the ranks of the clergy, was the decree that in every diocese where there was no university, a seminary should be established, where suitable young men were to be trained for the service of the sanctuary from their youth ;[7] by this means the formation of a clergy, who should be cultured and learned, would be assured.

---

[1] Sess. 6, c. 1.

[2] Sess. 6, c. 2.

[3] Sess. 24, c. 10.

[4] Sess. 6, c. 2, 3, ; sess. 7, c. 14 ; sess. 13, c. 5 ; sess. 14, c. 4 etc.

[5] Sess. 13, c. 1.

[6] Sess. 7, c. 15 ; sess. 22, c. 8.

[7] Sess. 13, c. 1.

[8] Sess. 24, c. 2.

[9] Sess. 22, c. 1.

[10] Sess. 14, Prooem.

[11] Sess. 24, c. 4.

Detailed steps were also taken to provide against the crying abuses in the system of benefices. Expectancies, as well as the *regressus* and *accessus*, were forbidden for the future,[8] as well as the bestowal of benefices on minors,[9] or canonries on such as would not be ordained, or perform the duties of their office.[10] The Council seeks with special strictness to protect the holy sacrifice of the Mass against all abuses arising from greed for gain, irreverence or superstition.[11] For the rest, no abuse of any importance which was existent at that time can be named for which provision was not made as far as possible. We have regulations against the court prelates,[1] begging clerics,[2] nepotism,[3] unauthorized preachers of indulgences,[4] too great or too small extension of parishes,[5] extravagances in the matter of church music,[6] and in the fine arts,[7] the encroachments of lay patrons and the nobles in ecclesiastical matters ;[8] and finally against monks who wander about outside their monasteries.[9] In its XXVth Session the Council occupied itself very minutely with the raising and renewal of the religious state.

---

[1] Sess. 6, c. 2 ; sess. 7, c. 3 ; sess. 23, c. 1.

[2] Sess. 14, c. 3.

[3] Sess. 21, c. 6.

[4] Sess. 7, c. 11 ; sess. 14, c. 2 ; sess. 23, c. 16.

[5] Sess. 7, c. 13 ; sess. 23, c. 7.

[6] Sess. 23, c. 5, 14.

[7] Sess. 23, c. 18.

[8] Sess. 24, c. 19 ; sess. 25, c. 7.

[9] Sess. 23, c. 6.

[10] Sess. 24, c. 12 ; sess. 22, c. 1.

[11] Sess. 22, de observandis et evitandis in celebratione missae.

Next to the reform of the clergy, the Council had the care of the Christian family specially at heart.[10] After having defended the unity, indissolubility, and the religious character of matrimony in its dogmatic definitions, the reform decrees endeavour to protect the holiness of the sacrament, and to prevent scandals by a renewed prohibition of secret marriages, by a limitation of the impediments to matrimony, by admonishing parish priests to exercise care in marrying persons unknown to them, or not resident in the place, and by providing for the complete freedom of all, and especially of the weaker sex, when entering upon this contract.

---

[1] Sess. 25, c. 17.

[2] Sess. 21, c. 2.

[3] Sess. 25, c. 1.

[4] Sess. 5, c. 2 ; sess. 21, c. 9.

[5] Sess. 21, c. 4-5.

[6] Sess. 22, de celebratione missae.

[7] Sess. 25, de invocatione sanctorum, We shall treat of this decree later on, when speaking of art during the period of Catholic reform.

[8] Sess. 22, c. 11 ; sess. 25, c. 9.

[9] Sess. 14, c. 11. "Thus in some way were pastoral activities dealt with by the Council, from those that were merely mechanical to those that were purely ideal, many being treated very minutely, much being laid down that was new, and everything being gone into more deeply." SWOBODA, 102.

[10] Sess. 24. For the influence of the Council of Trent upon the development of baptismal and matrimonial registers (a thing already done since the middle ages) *cf.* SÄGMÜLLER in the Tübingen Quartalschrift, LXXXI. (1899), 227 *seqq.*

After the fundamental lines for the renewal of life, both for the Church and the family, had been traced, there remained but one more field of activity for the work of reforming zeal, the field of politics. There can be no doubt that in the relations of the princes to the Church there was room for an immense number of improvements, and that a very great part of the most pressing evils was due to the fact that unworthy protégés had been intruded into ecclesiastical positions by secular officials and rulers; it was plain that Church property had been diverted from its original purpose, and that seculars influenced the government of the Church for their own selfish ends. The attempt, however, to appeal to the conscience of the princes raised a perfect storm of opposition among them.[1] No other course, therefore, was possible to the Council than to express in general terms the hope that the princes would fulfil their duties as Catholics and as the divinely appointed protectors of the faith and the Church, and to renew the old laws for the defence of ecclesiastical liberties, and to exhort the princes to observe them.[2]

Had it been given to the Council, by such exhortations as these, to bring the further development of absolutism to a standstill, then French, and with it European history, might have been spared the era of the revolution.

The true and intrinsic success of the Council lay within the Church itself, though even there its decrees were not all of them carried into effect everywhere or at once. The law, for example, concerning the provincial synods to be held every three years, was nowhere observed, except perhaps by St. Charles Borromeo.[3] In Germany the existing conditions made it necessary to unite several bishoprics in the hands of the son of some powerful prince. The reform of the cathedral chapters remained a pious wish in many places, while even the important decree concerning the clerical seminaries was not at once carried out everywhere. A great number of abuses, however, were removed, many reforms were carried out at once in many districts, and in others more slowly. Many excellent bishops, some of them saints, as Charles Borromeo of Milan (died 1584), Alessandro Sauli of Aleria in Corsica (died 1592), Turibio of Lima (died 1606), and Francis de Sales (died 1622) sought to realize the ideal of a bishop sketched by the Council of Trent. The provincial and diocesan synods, which had always proved so important for the renewal of the religious spirit, were revived later, especially in France. The Council acquired inestimable merit by its raising of the status of the secular priesthood. If this body, in modern times, occupies a far more important and influential position by the side of the regular clergy than it did in the middle ages, this must be attributed for the most part, to the better training which they received as the result of the decrees of the Council of Trent.

---

[1] *Cf. supra* p. 343.

[2] Sess. 25, c. 20.

[3] He held provincial synods in the years 1565, 1569, 1573, 1576, 1579, 1582.

To sum up, it is difficult to estimate too highly the importance of the Council of Trent, especially for the interior development of the Church. It laid the foundations of a true reform, and fixed Catholic doctrine on broad and systematic lines. It is at once a boundary line and a landmark, at which opposing spirits must separate, and it inaugurates a new epoch in the history of the Catholic Church.

APPENDIX

OF

UNPUBLISHED DOCUMENTS

AND

EXTRACTS FROM ARCHIVES.

APPENDIX.

PRELIMINARY NOTICE.

The following documents are intended to confirm and complete the text of my book; it has formed no part of my plan to provide a true and full collection of documents. In every case the place where the document was found is given with the greatest possible exactitude. As far as the text is concerned, I have, as a rule, preserved intact the wording of the documents or letters, which for the most part I have had before me in the original; there is no need for me to justify the changes I have made in the matter of capital letters and punctuation. Where I have ventured on alterations I have always noted the fact, though small mistakes and obvious copyist's errors have not been specially noted. The additions which I have made are enclosed in square brackets, while unintelligible or doubtful passages are marked by a note of interrogation or by the word "*sic.*" Those passages which I have omitted, either when copying the documents or in preparing them for the Press, and which were not essential or or unnecessary to my purpose, are marked by dots (. . .).

1. The Scrutinies in the Conclave of Pius IV.

From 9 September to 16 December, 1559.[1]

The Munich codex Clm 152, "Onuphrii Panvinii Veronensis fratri Eremitae Augustiniani De varia Romani Pontificis creatione liber 10," reproduces, p.302b-385, completely the schedules of the ballots (1 to 68) in the conclave of Pius IV.; each scrutiny gives about 45 schedules, and each of these, during the earlier part of the conclave contains for the most part the names of from 3 to 4 Cardinals, later on there are usually from 5 to 6, and after that from 7 to 9 names. To reprint the whole of this multitude of names—there are 132 folio pages—would be useless; moreover, it would not be possible to calculate on this basis, in the case of each Cardinal, the number of votes given to him on a single occasion, because all the Cardinals present are named on some of the schedules, *titulo honoris*, and none are omitted except Carlo Carafa, Innocenzo del Monte, and Simoncelli. Therefore, only in the case of the scrutinies 1 to 3, 37 to 40, and 66 to 68, have I reproduced the complete voting by way of example. For the rest it will suffice to give in the first place an outline of the 68 scrutinies, only naming those Cardinals who obtained more than ten votes, or who for some reason call for special mention; after that I will give in tabular form the number of votes cast in each scrutiny for the Cardinals whose names appear most frequently.

---

[1] See *supra*, pp. 1, 17, 19, 21, 24, 38, 42, 51.

I. SURVEY OF THE 68 SCRUTINIES.

(The numbers given by Bondonus in MERKLE II. 519, are given in [ ] with the letter B; thus "Pacheco 11 [B.18]" signifies that Pacheco had 11 votes according to the list of scrutinies and 18 according to Bondonus. After the date of the scrutiny there follows, with the letter Z, the number of schedules reproduced by Panvinio; "Z.42" therefore means that for that scrutiny Panvinio gives 42 schedules.)

1. (Saturday, 9 Sept.; Z 42): Pacheco received 15 votes; Puteo 8; Dolera and Rebiba 7; Lenoncourt, Carpi, Tournon 6; Scotti, Pisani, Reumano, Gonzaga, du Bellay, Cr. del Monte 5; D. Carafa 4; Ghislieri, Medici, Sforza, Cueva, Este 3; Cesi, Madruzzo, Truchsess, Cicada, Armagnac 2; Ricci, Farnese, Capodiferro, Carafa 1.

2. (Monday, 11 Sept.; Z 42): Cueva 17 [also Guidus in MERKLE II., 612; B 18]; Pacheco 12; Tournon 9; Gonzaga, Cicada, Puteo 5; Crispi, Carpi, Rebiba, Madruzzo, Lenoncourt 4; Saraceni, Farnese, Cesi, Este, Savelli, Scotti, Dolera 3; Dandino, Pisani, D. Carafa, Ghislieri, du Bellay, Capodiferro, Sforza, Ricci, Medici, Cr. del Monte, Truchsess 2; Reumano, A. Carafa, Cornaro, Vitelli, Corgna, Henry of Portugal 1.

3. (Tuesday, 12 Sept.; Z 43): Pacheco 11 [B 18]; Puteo, Gonzaga, Cueva, Dolera 8; Tournon 7; D. Carafa 6; Ghislieri, Carpi, Saraceni, Truchsess, Pisani 5; Cesi, Ricci, Crispi, Rebiba, Scotti, Dandino 4; Medici, Este, Farnese, Cicada, Corgna, Gaddi, Cornaro, Sforza 3; du Bellay, Rovere, Cr. del

Monte, Madruzzo, Savelli 2; Capodiferro, Reumano, Vitelli, Sermoneta, Carafa 1.

4. (Wednesday, 13 Sept.; Z 43): Lenoncourt 18 [B 18]; Pacheco 10; Dolera 8; Cueva 7; Cicada 6; Rebiba, Scotti 5.

5. (Thursday, 14 Sept.; Z 43): Henry of Portugal 15 [B 15]; Puteo 8; Cueva, Saraceni, Dandino, Pacheco 7; Cicada 6; D. Carafa, Cornaro 5; C. Carafa 1.

6. (Friday, 15 Sept.; Z 45): Pacheco 11 [B 12]; Puteo, Cr. del Monte 10; Dolera 7; Farnese, Cicada, Cueva 6; Truchsess, Scotti 5; Morone 1.[1]

7. (Saturday, 16 Sept.; Z 45): Pacheco 13 [B 12]; Ghislieri 11; Puteo 10; Dolera, Rebiba 8; D. Carafa 7; Cueva, Dandino 5; Scotti 4; Morone 3.

8. (Monday, 18 Sept.; Z 45): Carpi 14 [B 13]; Pacheco 11; Dolera 8; Rebiba, Scotti 7; Cicada, Cueva, Mercurio 5.

9. (Tuesday, 19 Sept.; Z 47): Pacheco 14; Carpi 12; D. Carafa 8 [B 14]; Dolera, du Bellay, Rebiba 7; Ricci 6; Crispi, Dandino 5; Morone 2.

10. (Wednesday, 20 Sept.; Z 46): Carpi 13 [B 14]; Puteo, Tournon 11; Pacheco 9; Dolera 8; Truchsess, Cicada, Cueva 6; Morone 2.

11. (Friday, 22 Sept.; Z 45): Pacheco 18 [B 18]; Tournon 15 and 5 accessits [also B]; Dolera 7; du Bellay, Armagnac 6; Farnese 5.—The 5 acceeding Cardinals are du Bellay, Armagnac, Armagnac (*sic* !), Crispi, Strozzi.

12. (Saturday, 23 Sept.; Z 44): Carpi 16 [B 16]; Pacheco 13; Cueva 11; Dolera, Truchsess, Ricci 7; Corgna 6.

13. (Monday, 25 Sept.; Z 46): Cr. del Monte 13 [B 13]; Carpi, Pacheco, Tournon 11; Cueva, Dolera 10; D. Carafa 9.

14. (Tuesday, 26 Sept.; Z 45): Pacheco 22 [B 23; also Vargas in DÖLLINGER, Beitr., I, 226][2]; Cueva 17; Truchsess, Crispi 9; D. Carafa 7.

15. (Wednesday, 27 Sept.; Z 46): Pacheco 20 [B 21]; Cueva 18 [B 18]; Saraceni 13; Dandino 10 [B 10]; Tournon 10; Cr. del Monte 7; Truchsess 5; Morone 2.

16. (Thursday, 28 Sept.; Z 45): Pacheco 17; Cueva 12 [B 18]; D. Carafa 12; Truchsess 9; Cr. del Monte 8; Crispi 7; Gonzaga, Puteo 4.

---

[1] From this point onwards Moorne always obtained at least one vote. In the scrutinies 18-46, one schedule always contains the names of Cueva and Morone, and 47-68, one always those of Cueva, Morone, Pacheco.

[2] One schedule appears to have been lost, there being only 45 instead of 46,

17. (Saturday, 30 Sept.; Z 45): Pacheco 18 [B 18]; Cueva 14; D. Carafa 9; Cr. del Monte 8; du Bellay 7; Dolera, Rebiba 6; Morone 2.

18. (Monday, 2 Oct.; Z 46): Pacheco 20 [B 20]; Cueva 16; Dolera 8; du Bellay, Cr. del Monte 7.

19. (Tuesday, 3 Oct.; Pacheco 19 [B 20]; Cueva 17; Crispi 12; D. Carafa, Rebiba 7; Innoc. del Monte 1.

20. (Thursday, 5 Oct.; Z 45): Pacheco 20 [B 18]; Saraceni 16; Cueva 15; Scotti 11; D. Carafa 9; Dolera 7.

21. (Friday, 6 Oct.; Z 45): Pacheco 19 [B 18]; Rebiba 17; Reumano 16; Cueva 15; Cr. del Monte 11; Corgna 6.

22. (Saturday, 7 Oct.; Z 46): Pacheco 20 [B 20]; Saraceni 19; Cueva 13; Dolera, du Bellay 8; Cicada 7; Corgna, Madruzzo 6; Capodiferro 5.

23. (Monday, 9 Oct.; Z 45): Pacheco 21; Cueva 18; Truchsess 13; Corgna 7; Lorraine 5.

24. (Tuesday, 10 Oct.; Z 45): Pacheco 18 [B 19]; Cueva 16; D. Carafa, Cicada 10; Truchsess 7; de Givry 1.

25. (Wednesday, 11 Oct.; Z 45): Pacheco 19 [B 18]; Cueva 15; Strozzi 10; Gaddi 9; Cicada 8; Farnese, Corgna 5; C. Carafa 4; Bourbon, Vitelli 1.

26. (Thursday, 12 Oct.; Z 45): Pacheco 20 [B 21]; Ghislieri 20; Cueva 16; Cicada 11; Corgna 8; Dolera 7; Vitelli 1.

27. (Friday, 13 Oct.; Z 44): Ran. Farnese 21 [B 22][1]; Pacheco 20; Cueva 14; Innoc. del Monte 2; de Givry, Carafa 1.

28. (Saturday, 14 Oct.; Z 44): Pacheco 21 [B 21]; Cueva 17; Puteo, Rebiba 9; Dolera 8; Innoc. del Monte 3; Morone 1. (One name, de Mec, unintelligible.)

29. (Monday, 16 Oct.; Z 44): Pacheco 21 [B 21]; Cueva 17; Gaddi 14; Cicada 8.

30. (Tuesday, 17 Oct.; Z 44): Savelli 22 [B 22]; Pacheco 18; Cueva 17; du Bellay, Cr. del Monte 8; Corgna 6; C. and A. Carafa 1.

31. (Thursday, 19 Oct.; Z 46): Pacheco 19 [B 19]; Cueva 15; Cicada 10; du Bellay 9; Capizuchi 8; Truchsess 7; Ricci 6; A. Carafa 1.

32. (Friday, 20 Oct.; Z 44): Pacheco 21; Cueva 16;

---

[1] It was the anniversary of the election of Paul III. (See Vol. XI. of this work, p. 14). In the *Avviso di Roma of 14 October, 1559 (Urb. 1039, p. 95, Vatic Library), Ran. Farnese received 22 votes and 4 accessits.

Crispi 13; Cr. del Monte 9; Dolera, D. Carafa, Cicada, du Bellay 7.

33. (Saturday, 21 Oct.; Z 45): Pacheco 21 [B 21]; Cueva 17; Crispi 10; Cicada, du Bellay 9; Bourbon 1.

34. (Monday, 23 Oct.; Z 48): Pacheco 22 [B 19]; Cueva 20; D. Carafa 15; Crispi 12; Simoncelli 1.

35. (Tuesday, 24 Oct.; Z 44): Pacheco 19 [B 18]; Cueva 15; Cicada 11; Crispi 10.

36. (Wednesday, 25 Oct.; Z 45): Pacheco 18; Cueva 16; Carafa 2.

37. (Thursday, 26 Oct.; Z 46): Pacheco 19; Cueva 17; Saraceni 11; D. Carafa 10; Cicada 9; Ghislieri, Dandino, Cr. del Monte, Madruzzo 7; Dolera, Crispi, du Bellay, Bertrand 6; Truchsess, Gonzaga, Corgna, Pisani, Puteo, Tournon, Scotti, Ricci 5; Carpi, Lenoncourt, Rebiba, Ch. Guise 4; Este, Mercurio 3; Cesi, A. Farnese, Capodiferro, Gaddi, A. Carafa, Savelli, Vitelli, Reumano, Medici 2; Cornaro, Morone, Sermoneta, Sforza, Urbino, Ran. Farnese, Simoncelli 1.

38. (Friday, 27 Oct.; Z 46): Pacheco 20; Cueva 17; Saraceni 10; Crispi 9; Cicada, du Bellay, Tournon 8; Gonzaga 7; Dolera, Capodiferro, Medici, Corgna, Pisani, Reumano 6; Ghislieri, D. Carafa, Carpi, Dandino, Cr. del Monte, Mercurio, Puteo 5; Cesi, Este, Truchsess, Carafa, Madruzzo 4; Armagnac, Rebiba 3; Farnese, Lenoncourt, A. Carafa, Sforza, Scotti, Ricci, Vitelli, Guise, Rovere 2; Morone, Savelli, Sermoneta, Bertrand, Ran. Farnese, Mariae in Argo (Mariae in Aquiro=Este [?]) 1.

39. (Monday, 30 Oct.; Z 46): Pacheco 19; Cueva 18; Gonzaga 11; Cicada 10; D. Carafa 8; Carpi, Este, du Bellay, Rebiba, Saraceni 7; Ghislieri, Tournon, Puteo, Crispi 6; Dolera, Dandino, Mercurio, Pisani 5; Capodiferro, Cr. del Monte, Madruzzo 4; Cesi, Medici [Priscae], Corgna, Sermoneta, Ran. Farnese, Bertrand 3; Cornaro, Farnese, A. Carafa, Sforza, Ricci, Vitelli, Guise 2; Truchsess, Gaddi, Lenoncourt, Lorraine, Morone, Reumano, Savelli, Scotti, Strozzi, Rovere 1.

40. (Tuesday, 31 Oct.; Z 48): Pacheco 16; Cueva 15; Capizuchi 11; D. Carafa, Rebiba 10; Saraceni 9; Ghislieri, Carpi, Crispi, Cr. del Monte, Madruzzo 7; Gonzaga, Cicada, Mercurio, Scotti 6; Este, Medici [Priscae], Puteo, Dandino, Pisani 5; Corgna, Savelli, Guise 4; Cesi, Tournon, Dolera,

du Bellay, Farnese, Lenoncourt, Reumano, Ricci 3; Carafa, Capodiferro, A. Carafa, Strozzi, Ran. Farnese 2; Truchsess, Gaddi, Lorraine, Morone, Sforza, Rovere, Monte, Bertrand 1.

41. (Friday, 3 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco, Cueva 17; Cr. del Monte 14; Saraceni 13; du Bellay 10; Crispi, Dandino, Pisani 9.

42. (Saturday, 4 Nov.; Z 48): Cueva 16; Pacheco 15; Dandino 13; D. Carafa, Cicada 11; Rebiba 10; Crispi, A. Carafa 8; Corgna 6; Guise 5.

43. (Monday, 6 Nov.; Z 48): Cueva 18; Pacheco 17; Ghislieri, Gonzaga 10; Saraceni 9; Crispi 8; Ricci 6; Henry of Portugal 5; Bourbon, Innoc. del Monte, C. Carafa[1] 1.

44. (Tuesday, 7 Nov.; Z ?[2]): Pacheco 17; Cueva 17; Saraceni, Cicada 11; Dolera, Ghislieri, du Bellay 10.

45. (Thursday, 9 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 20; Cueva 18; Rebiba 12; Crispi 11; Reumano 9.

46. (Friday, 10 Nov.; Z 48): Cueva 20, Pacheco 19; Rovere 12; Este 10; Cornaro 9; Bourbon 1.

47. (Monday, 13 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 19; Cueva, du Bellay 15; D. Carafa 13; Rebiba 12; Gonzaga 10.

48. (Tuesday, 14 Nov.; Z 46): Pacheco 19; Cueva 17; Tournon 12; Cicada 11; Guise 9; Saraceni 8.

49. (Wednesday, 15 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 20; Cueva 15; Rebiba 10.

50. (Thursday, 16 Nov.; Z 47): Pacheco 22; Cueva 15; du Bellay 12; Carpi, Tournon 11; Carafa, Guise 6.

51. (Friday, 17 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 21; Cueva 13; Carpi, Cicada 12; Tournon, Saraceni 11; Innoc. del Monte, Vitelli [S. Mariae in Porticu) 1.

52. (Monday, 20 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 17; Cueva 14; D. Carafa, Carpi 12; Saraceni 12.

53. (Tuesday, 21 Nov.; Z 48): Saraceni 18; Pacheco 17; Cueva 14; du Bellay 12; Cicada, Carpi 11.

54. (Thursday, 23 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 19; Cueva 18; Saraceni 15; D. Carafa, Cicada 12; Carpi, Tournon 11; Guise 9.

55. (Friday, 24 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 17; Saraceni 14; Cueva 13; Cicada 12; Tournon 10; Guise 8.

56. (Monday, 27 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 17; Cueva 15; Saraceni 13; Tournon 12; du Bellay 11; Guise 5.

---

[1] C. Carafa received from now onwards several votes in each scrutiny.

[2] On account of the confused division of the lines in the manuscript, it is impossible to be certain as to this.

57. (Tuesday, 28 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 19; Rebiba 14; Cueva, Tournon 12; Saraceni 11; Reumano 9; Guise 6; Capizuchi 5; Bourbon 1.

58. (Wednesday, 29 Nov.; Z 48): Pacheco 18; Cueva 13; D. Carafa 12; Tournon 11; Saraceni 10; Guise 8.

59. (Friday, 1 Dec.; Z 48): Pacheco 18; Este 12; Cueva, Saraceni, Tournon 11; Gonzaga, D. Carafa 10; Guise 7.

60. (Saturday, 2 Dec.; Z 46): Pacheco 17; Gonzaga 12; Este, Cicada 11; Cueva, Cr. del Monte, Saraceni, Tournon 10.

61. (Monday, 4 Dec.; Z 47[1]): Cueva 16; Pacheco 15; Este 12; Saraceni 12; Gonzaga 11; Cicada, Rebiba 10.

62. (Tuesday, 5 Dec.; Z 46): Pacheco 17; Cueva 16; Saraceni 13; Cesi 12; Tournon 11; Este, du Bellay 10.

63. (Wednesday, 6 Dec.; Z 46): Pacheco 15; Cueva 14; Cr. del Monte 12; Este, Saraceni 11; Gonzaga, Rebiba 10.

64. (Saturday, 9 Dec.; Z 46): Pacheco, Cueva 18; Tournon, Saraceni 11.—To schedule 40 there is attached the remark: "Non erat appositum verbum [i.e., some word or sentence, which should have been placed as a token outside the folded schedule], et ideo fuit disputatum an valeret, et fuit conclusum, quod aperiretur, et erat (Turnonius, Mantuanus, Ferrariensis)."

65. (Monday, 11 Dec.; Z 46): Pacheco 17; Cueva 15; Tournon, Cesi 13; Dolera 11; Rebiba 10.

66. (Wednesday, 13 Dec.; Z 46): Cueva 18; Pacheco 17; Cesi 10; Este, Rebiba 9; Carpi, Saraceni, Guise 8; Cicada, Cr. del Monte, Corgna, Tournon 7; Ghislieri, D. Carafa, Truchsess, du Bellay, Gonzaga 6; Dolera, Carafa, Pisani, Savelli, Capizuchi, Ran. Farnese 5; Armagnac, Crispi, Medici, Rovere 4; A. Carafa, Scotti, Madruzzo 3; Cornaro, Mercurio, Morone, Puteo, Reumano 2; A. Farnese, Gaddi, Henry of Portugal, Sermoneta, Sforza, Bertrand 1.

67. (Thursday, 14 Dec.; Z 45): Pacheco 18; Cueva, Saraceni 16; Tournon, Gonzaga, Cesi 10; Cicada, Cr. del Monte 9; Ghislieri, Este, Dolera 8; D. Carafa 7; Carpi, Rebiba 6; Pisani, Puteo, Guise 5; C. and A. Carafa, Corgna, Reumano, Scotti, Rovere 4; Truchsess, Crispi, Gaddi, Mercurio, Madruzzo, Ricci 3; Sermoneta, Strozzi, Capizuchi,

---

[1] Schedules 9 and 10 are exactly alike, and since we know from Bondonus that from December 1 to 13 the conclave had only 46 members, it follows that the writer must by mistake have written his schedule twice over.

Ran. Farnese 2; Armagnac, du Bellay, Medici, Morone, Savelli, Simoncelli, de Givry, Vendôme, Vitelli[1] 1.

68. (Saturday 16, Dec.; Z 46): Pacheco 19; Cueva 17; Tournon, Saraceni 11; Cesi, Cicada 9; Carpi, Armagnac, Reumano 8; Puteo, Rebiba, Corgna, D. Carafa 7; Dolera, Truchsess, Gonzaga, Madruzzo 6; Este, Ghislieri, Crispi, Cr. del Monte, Mercurio, Guise 5; Gaddi, Rovere, Pisani, Vitelli, Bertrand 3; A. Carafa, Strozzi, Sermoneta, Savelli 2; du Bellay, Morone, Sforza, Scotti, Ricci, Ran. Farnese, Capizuchi, Simoncelli 1.

II. Votes Recorded for the Principal Candidates.

(For Pacheco and Cueva see under I.)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Carpi . . .	6	4	5	6	6	7	7	14	12	13	9	16	11	4	2	3	7
Cesi	2	3	4	3	4	5	4	1	2	5	3	2	1	2	3	5	5
Este. . . .	3	3	3	2	1	2	4	2	1	4	4	3	5	3	2	5	5
Ghislieri .	3	2	5	2	3	4	11	3	4	5	5	4	4	1	1	2	1
Gonzaga .	5	5	8	2	2	2	6	4	2	1	1	3	3	2	2	4	4
Medici[2] . .	3	2	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	6	5	4	3	1	—	4
Pisani . . .	5	2	5	4	3	3	6	1	1	2	4	6	1	2	4	4	5
Puteo. . . .	8	5	8	4	8	10	10	9	8	11	6	6	6	4	5	4	7
Reumano	5	1	1	4	2	3	5	4	2	3	3	—	2	1	—	1	2
Saraceni .	—	3	5	2	7	4	3	6	6	4	3	4	2	—	13	6	4
Tournon .	6	9	7	4	6	8	7	9	8	11	15	7	11	8	10	7	8

	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34
Carpi . . .	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	6	5	5	7	7	8	6	5	6
Cesi	5	2	4	4	5	3	3	7	7	6	3	4	4	2	4	4	3
Este. . . .	3	5	6	3	3	6	1	4	2	5	6	6	4	5	7	6	2
Ghislieri .	3	3	1	3	7	7	2	3	20	5	5	4	2	1	1	5	4
Gonzaga .	5	4	7	4	5	6	3	5	5	4	7	7	5	3	8	8	7
Medici. . .	3	1	2	3	3	—	7	7	6	4	5	3	3	1	4	2	2
Pisani . . .	4	4	7	5	5	4	3	9	6	4	4	9	5	4	6	2	5
Puteo. . .	6	6	8	5	6	7	6	7	5	5	9	3	2	2	5	5	8
Reumano	1	2	—	16	1	—	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	4	2	2
Saraceni .	6	2	16	4	19	4	6	8	4	3	3	2	—	6	7	6	7
Tournon .	7	4	3	7	6	6	5	4	5	8	7	8	7	9	5	8	5

---

[1] In schedule 38, in a space left blank by the writer, an illegible name (Lotharingus ?) has been written in another hand.

[2] The votes given for "S. Prisca" are counted as being in favour of Cardinal Medici. That the Cardinal "S. Priscae" (in spite of Massarelli in MERKLE, II., 339) was no other than Medici, is not only proved from Panvinio (*Nomina cardinalium viventium, quando Pius IV. creatus est; Clm 152, p. 429b, and in MERKLE II., 590; *cf.* CIACONIUS III., 736, 867, 868, 869), but also follows from the list of scrutinies itself. In scrutinies 57-8, 60-3, there is a schedule with the names: Portuensis, Albanensis, *S. Priscae*. In scrutiny 59, this schedule no longer appears, but another with the names Portuensis, Albanensis, *Medici*. *Cf.* also the two schedules in scrutiny 65, vote 21: Praenestinus, Albanensis, Medici, and scrutiny 66, vote 14: Praenestinus, S. Priscae.

	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51
Carpi . . .	5	4	4	5	7	7	7	5	4	6	5	5	8	8	9	11	12
Cesi	3	2	2	4	3	3	3	7	7	7	4	5	5	6	4	5	3
Este . . .	8	7	3	4	7	5	8	7	7	3	5	10	7	6	9	5	8
Ghislieri .	3	3	7	5	6	7	5	6	10	10	7	4	5	6	6	5	8
Gonzaga .	5	7	5	7	11	6	5	7	10	5	5	9	10	8	7	8	7
Medici . .	4	3	2	6	3	5	2	4	5	4	5	4	5	4	3	6	4
Pisani. . .	5	5	5	6	5	5	9	5	4	4	2	4	6	5	3	3	4
Puteo . . .	4	6	5	5	6	5	8	8	6	7	7	8	8	4	7	6	6
Reumano	3	7	2	6	1	3	3	6	2	2	9	3	4	1	5	7	4
Saraceni .	8	9	11	10	7	9	13	4	9	11	7	6	5	8	7	8	11
Tournon .	7	7	5	8	6	3	4	9	6	8	6	9	8	12	5	11	11

	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68
Carpi . . .	12	11	11	9	8	7	6	5	7	7	8	7	6	5	8	6	8
Cesi	6	7	9	9	8	4	9	5	8	9	12	7	6	13	10	10	9
Este . . .	9	8	6	7	7	7	8	12	11	12	10	11	8	7	9	8	5
Ghislieri .	6	6	8	6	5	5	4	7	8	6	6	7	7	6	6	8	5
Gonzaga .	9	6	7	8	8	4	5	10	12	11	8	10	8	8	6	10	6
Medici . .	3	5	6	3	7	4	5	3	3	2	2	1	5	4	4	1	—
Pisani . . .	2	7	8	4	6	6	8	6	4	4	5	3	3	3	5	5	3
Puteo . . .	8	5	5	5	3	4	4	5	5	5	2	4	5	5	2	5	7
Reumano	7	4	5	7	5	9	5	7	2	5	4	5	8	5	2	4	8
Saraceni .	12	18	15	14	13	11	10	11	10	12	13	11	11	5	8	16	11
Tournon .	8	6	11	10	12	12	11	11	10	8	11	9	11	13	7	10	11

2. FRANCESCO DI GUADAGNO TO THE DUKE OF MANTUA.

1559, September 20, Roma.[1]

. . . Sabato andò in rotta una pratichetta di Medici, condotta da Farnese et Caraffa, ma ella non trovò buon piede, tanto piu che si scoperse che volesson far senza il Camarlingo, che è tanto principale la dentro. Del s. card^{e} nostro speravano tuttavia meglio con il servitio de Francesi, i quali pareva che cominciassero a lasciarsi indurre a far bene. La domenica fu rinfrescata la pratica di Medici, et perche i Franzesi davan qualche intentione di conscendervi, era in bona spettatione. La notte sequente Ferrara cominciò a esser dietro alle sue pratiche gagliardamente et per tutto il giorno sequente non restò di tempestare, benchè ogn' homo conoscessi l' impossibilità. Farnese per paura la sera fece mezo segno di voler andare ad adorare Carpi per far risolvere Ferrara, ma essendo il numero de suoi complici tanto poco la cosa si risolvette in passeggiare fino alle quattro hore per capella. Hieri più che mai si attese a far pratiche per Carpi dalli adversarii di Ferrara

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 19, nn. 4, 6.

et se egli non si risolvessi, la cosa potrebbe essere pericolosa. Questa occasione potrebbe servire per il s. card^le nostro, essendoci chi attende alle contramine in servigio di S. S. Ill^ma, et se si continua nel modo cominciò, fra poco si potrebbe sentir il scoppio dell' uno et dell' altro. Scrivendo questa mi è sopragionto aviso che la furia di Carpi è in gran parte cessata, ma non saria gran cosa che questa notte si rinfrescassi. Questo contrapeso fa molto per noi, per Medici et Puteo, ma se Ferrara si risolverà il nostro ne haverà meglio di tutti. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

3. The Dispatches of Marcantonio da Mula.

Marcantonio da Mula, who was generally spoken of in the Curia as Amulio, came to Rome in the middle of May, 1560, as the successor of Mocenigo, and there won particular favour with Pius IV., who, on February 26th, 1561, honoured him by bestowing the purple on him. By accepting this dignity, Mula incurred lasting disgrace from his own government. For the life of this man, who was distinguished in every way, and who in 1565 was named prefect of the Vatican Library, and died on March 13th, 1570, *cf.* besides the sources cited *supra* p. 162, n. 3, MAZZUCHELLI, I., 2, 651 *seq.*; Mon. Slav. merid., VIII., 86, n.; TURBA, Depeschen, II., xii. *seq.* III., 168 n. 2; MERKLE, Concil. Trid., II.; HILLIGER, 115 *seq*; : LIEBMANN, Deutsches Land und Volk nach ital. Berichterstattern der Reformationszeit, 57 *seq.*, Berlin, 1910; Lettere di Marcantonio da Mula a Gian Giorgio Trissino, published by E. PIOVENE in 1878 at Vicenza. Some letters of Mula in CICOGNA, Iscriz. Ven., VI., 737 *seq.* Of his papers preserved in the Cod. Vatic. lat. 3933, his speech to Pius IV. in 1560 was printed in Latin and Italian at Venice in 1846, as was a letter to P. Manutius in the Mél. d'archéol., III., 276 *seq.* The despatches of Mula from the Imperial court, where he represented his country from 1552 to 1554, were published in a masterly way by Turba in the second volume of his Venez. Depeschen. Concerning them Turba says: "Mula is among the most talented of the Venetian ambassadors at the Imperial court. He is not a mere mouthpiece, through whom one feels that others are speaking, but he rises superior to the events, circumstances and moods, of which he is making his report, and penetrates below the surface, estimating them in the light of their bearing on the future. More than any of his predecessors already named he falls into the defect of unnecessary repetition, a thing which, however, may be forgiven on account of the zeal with which he served his government. In spite of the haste with which he drew up his reports, his style and language are far more clear and polished than in the case of his predecessors." (II., 40). The same judgment holds good of the despatches of Mula from his embassy in Rome, which on account of the interest of their contents, were very quickly copied. As will be seen from the following list, some of them are to be found in almost all the great collections of manuscripts in Europe.

BERLIN, Royal Library: Inf. Polit. VIII. (reports from May 18 to Sept. 21, 1560); Inf. Polit. XIII. (reports from Sept. 24 to Nov. 28, 1560); Inf. Polit. XXXVII. (reports from the end of Jan. to Feb. 25, 1561).

BOLOGNA, University Library: Cod. 2469 (Libr. of S. Salvatore 745).

CARPENTRAS, Library: Cod. 543.

INNSBRUCK, University Library: Cod. 600 (reports from May 18 to Sept. 21, 1560). The codex has the note: "Cod. fuit Bibl. Mantuanæ direptæ post mortem ultimi ducis."

LONDON, British Museum: Addit. 16534 (reports from June 15 to July 22, 1560).

MANTUA, Capilupi Library: register in 4 vols.

PARIS, Bibl. Nationale: cf. Montfaucon, Bibl. I. 1093; Marsand II. 104 *seq.*

ROME. 1, Boncompagni Archives: Cod. E. 2 (reports of 1560); 2, Vatican Library: Urb. 1027 (reports from May 18, 1560 to March 8, 1561); Urb. 1670, p. 79b—90 (reports on the Carafa); Barb. 5761 (formerly LXII., 11): reports from 1560 to March 8, 1561; cf. Montfaucon, Bibl. I. 174; 3, Papal Secret Archives: Miscell. III. p. 24 (reports from May 22, 1560, to March 20, 1561); Bolognetti, Cod. 22 and 23.

VENICE, State Archives, Filza XIII.

VIENNA, Court Library 6749 (Fosc. 18), p. 319-425 (reports from May 18 to Sept. 21, 1560).

All these codices, even that in the State Archives, Venice, are copies,[1] in which the text, and especially the dates, are often incorrect.

On account of this great multiplication of the reports in the codices, it is no wonder that they have often been used, and with much profit, by historical investigators. Probably the first to use them was the indefatigable Raynaldus, who availed himself of them for his annals (1560, n. 57), from a codex of Cardinal Spada. Pallavicini made fuller use of them, after his rival Sarpi had done so. Ranke drew upon them from the Berlin codex (Fürsten und Völker, I., 368 ; Papste[8] I., 207, 211, and III., 50*). It is strange that Sickel did not avail himself of this valuable source, the more so as the codex in the Court Library, Vienna, was easily accessible to him. On the other hand, Šusta has used them, as has Ancel, in their description of the fall of the Carafa. I refrain from printing the reports of Mula on the Council in deference to the publication of Ehses. Mula is also deserving of a monograph on account of the literary style of his reports.

4. CARDINAL C. CARAFA TO THE DUKE OF PALIANO.[2]

1560, June 1, Roma.

Ill^{mo} et ecc^{mo} sig^{re} mio e fratello osserv^{mo}.

Mando con questa a V. E. copia delle lettere che il sig^{r} Fabritio ha scritto ultimamente di corte, così a S. S^{tà} come a me et al sig^{r} Ferrante, e vedra che forma di resolutione hanno presa fino adesso le cose nostre ; e a me pare che le parole del sig^{r} Fabritio si devino molto ben considerare, et che da quelle si possa trarre certa speranza che, se bene S. M^{tà} non ha determinato sopra il fatto de la ricompensa, sia non di meno questo negocio per riuscire a tutta nostra sodisfattione, et tanto più quanto io ci vedo S. S^{tà}, dalla quale ha da depender tutto questo fatto, dispositissima, come è stata sempre ; si ch'io giudico che V. Ecc^{za} possa starne con l'animo riposato e sicuro, perche anco dal canto nostro non si mancarà di fare quanto sarà possibile.

Quanto al venir di V. Ecc^{za} qua, è tutto in arbitrio suo[3] ; ma quando pure le paresse di aspettare l'arrivo del sig^{re} Fabritio, poi che non potra tardare cinque o sei giorni più,

---

[1] The two reports of Mula of May 22 and August 20, 1560, are in the original in the State Archives, Venice, Filza XII.

[2] See *supra*, p. 142, n. 4.

[3] In the original underlined in a later hand.

per haver qualche chiareza più delle cose, rimetto il tutto a lei, aspettando che mi faccia intendere quanto risolverà, et li baso le mani.

Di Roma il primo di giugno Lx.

Di V. Ecc^{za}

servitore

S^{r} Duca di Paliano.

Il cardinale Carafa.

[Orig. Miscell. X 197 p. 18 *seq.* Papal Secret Archives.]

5. CONSISTORY OF 7 JUNE, 1560[1].

Die veneris VII. iunii fuit consistorium secretum in loco solito, a quo ex supradictis xxxix, qui erant Romae, abfuere Turnonus, de Carpo, Armeniacus, Augustanus, Messanensis, Puteus, Alexandrinus, Araeceli, Bertrandus, Urbinas, de Monte, Cornelius et de Medicis.

Antequam papa descenderet ad consistorium, fuerunt vocati eius iussu revm̃us dominus cardinalis Carafa nepos et revm̃us dominus Alfonsus cardinalis Neapolis pronepos papae Pauli IV. et missi ad arcem Sancti Angeli.

Descendit postea Sua Sanctitas ad consistorium et de ea actione rationem reddidit ceteris cardinalibus et terminavit consistorium.

Copy. Acta Camer. IX. 22^{b}. Consistorial archives of the Vatican.

6. GIOV. BATTISTA RICASOLI TO COSIMO I., DUKE OF FLORENCE.[2]

1560, Juni 7, Roma.

. . . Questa mattina sendo tutti i cardinali in consistorio eccetto però Medici, fu chiamato da monsignore Aurelio Spina per parte di S. Santità il cardinale Carafa, il quale allegramente per la lumaca salì nelle stanze dove dà audienza S. B^{ne} la quale però non vi era, et io che vedendolo chiamare giudicai potesse essere quello che è stato, me le inviai dietro. Arrivato di sopra li fu detto dal maestro di camera che aspettasse, in quel mentre fu chiamato il cardinale di Napoli, et arrivato dal zio nelle prefate stanze, il signor Gabrio fattosi loro incontro disse all' uno, et all' altro che gl'erano prigioni di S. S^{tà} et che haveva commissione di condurli all'ora in castello. Carafa senza smarrirsi rispose, questi sono i frutti delle mie buone opere, l'altro si smarrì, et non disse nulla. Intanto al Governatore et al Fiscale fu comandato che andassero a fare prigione il conte di Montorio, che si trovava alloggiato in casa di Carafa et dalli detti fu messo in un cocchio, et condotto in Castello, et nel medesimo tempo fu anco preso il vescovo di Civita di Penne già governatore di Bologna. Io che mi trovai presente alla cattura di questi due Ill$^{n.i}$ ritornatomene in consistoro et dettolo a tre o quattro di quei signori in uno instante si vedde uno bisbiglio, et una trasfiguratione di volti difficile a essere scritta; infra i quali cardinale Vitelli ancora che li sia parso uno strano gioco, si sforzava con grandissima arte di dissimulare. Il cardinale di Ferrara quando io gli ne dissi, si turbò meravigliosamente con dirmi, è egli vero! che cose sono queste! Intanto essendo gia sonate le XIV. hore S. S^{tà} se ne venne in consistorio con si buona cera, et si allegra quanto io l'habbia veduta altra volta; et maravigliandosene molti mostrai loro ch'essi havevano il torto, perchè S. B^{ne} era fuora di quel pensiero, che forse per il passato lo haveva tenuto talvolta occupato. Ai cardinali, o almeno alla maggior parte non è dubio nessuno che è parso strano parendo si spesseggi troppo, ma allo universale, per quanto già si comprende, ha satisfatto questa resoluta attione di S. S^{tà} meravigliosamente; et non è gran fatto poichè eghi havevano senza mai fare piacere a nessuno offeso ogni huomo.

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 143, n. 3.

[2] See *supra*, p. 143, n. 3.

[Orig. Florence State Archives, Medic. 3280 p. 174]

7. Avviso di Roma of 8 June, 1560.[1]

. . . Et l'istesso giovedì vers'un'hora di notte venne qui il conte di Montorio per le poste di Galese molto pomposamente et andò allogiar nel palazzo del card. Caraffa suo fratello, ove era anch'il card. di Napoli et v'era apparecchiato un bellissimo bancheto et vi fu anch'invitato il prince di Sulmona, il quale per alcuni negocii privati era gia 3 dì prima venut'in Roma. Stavano con molt'allegrezza, con tanti suoni, balli et comedie, andando poi bona parte di quella notte per Roma a sollazzo in cocchi con cortegiane cantando et sonando molt' allegramente ; dicesi la causa dell' allegrezza esser stata per le buone nove che di Spagna l'haveva portato il sig^{r} Ferrante de Sanguini di S. M^{tà} Catholica, ciò è che quella deve al card. Caraffa 12^{m} scudi di pensione che l'haveva promisso in tempo di Paulo IV sopra l'arcivesccvato di Toledo et le paghe scorse in tutto questo tempo et 8^{m} scudi di naturalezza et al duca di Paliano che fu dava tutto quell' era stato capitolato e promessoli in tempo di Paulo sudetto. Ma questa lor allegrezza durò pocho, imperho che la mattina seguente, che fu hieri, havendo S. S^{tà} convocato il consistoro, ordinò che subito venend' il card^{le} Caraffa et Napoli a palazzo, dovessero venire a parlarli alla sua camera ; il che fecero, ma volendovi andare et passand' appresso la via che va al corritorio del Castello, gli fu detto che d'ordine di S. S^{tà} andasser' in Castello ; et fu Caraffa il primo accompagnato del sig^{1} Gabrio Cerbellone nipote di S S^{tà}, et non si smarrì punto, ma vedendo poi venir Napoli et intendendo l'ordine di Sua S^{tà}, divenne più morto che vivo et vi andò ancora lui con alcuni loro più favoriti ; et tutt' in un tempo mandò il Papa al palazzo del Carafa il barigello con tutti li sbirri per il conte di Montorio, il quale mostrò alla prima di voler fare un poco di resistentia, ma vedendosi poi circondato di tanta compagnia, si rese e montat' in cocchio andò in Castello : et era il cocchio del governatore il qual er' andat' in persona a levarlo. Fu poi inventorisato et sequestrato per il fisco tutto ciò che havevan in loro palazzi, et portato in palazzo del Papa il più importante. Et incontinente andò il barigello per tutto cercando la famiglia loro, della quale sonno poi stati presi circa 20 et alcuni fugiti. Tra li presi sonno il conte d'Aliffa cognato del conte di Montorio, ch'è quello ch'amazzò la moglie sua sorella ; poi Torquato Conte ch'era l'anima et governo del card^{le} Caraffa nelli suoi trionfi, poi Cesare Brancaccio, il sig^{r} Ferrante de Sanguini, Hieronimo Episcopo, il vescovo di Civita di Penna, Mattheo Stendardi, li quali tutti sonno stati li seguaci delli Caraffa et più favoriti. Si cercano ancora dell'altri, et si dice ch'il Papa ha detto chel haverà anch'il marchese di Montebello, si ben è a Napoli, a tal che li Caraffi stann'a mal partito ; et così anch'il card^{le} di Monte, il quale si dice che ha la febre terzana, et pochi sonno che non si rallegrino della pregionia delli Caraffi, massime il populo romano già di loro tanto offeso. Dicesi ch'il card^{le} di Napoli ha robbato alla morte di Paulo IV. circa 18^{m} scudi; oltre li altri robbamenti di che haveranno da render conto, s'oppone morte di più persone, sforzamenti di donzelle et stupri horrendissimi che meritano ogni acerbissimo castigo. Dicesi che la signora donna Giovanna Aragona ha dato bonissima mancia a colui che portò la nuova di queste cose seguite. S'intese poi ch'andando quella mattina Sua S^{tà} in consistero, era in tanta colera che per camino non si ricordò di dare la beneditione ad alcuno: di che ogn'uno stava maravegliato, et in concistoro non ragionò quas'altro che dell'indignità di questi Caraffi e Monte, et di quanto scandalo eran'al mondo in questi tempi travagliosi che tutt'il mondo grida contra la S^{tà} Sede Apostolica per li dishonorati suggietti ch'in quella sonno; et voltatosi poi alli suoi nipoti disse: Questo vi sia per essempio et a tutti, et al rev^{mo} Santa Fiore camerlengo disse: Monsignore, adesso serà tempo de redintegrarvi di quello vi è stato toltó. Rispos'egli: Pater Sancte, io non desider'altro che quello veramente m'appartiene, et assai mi duole il mal d'altri. Saggiunse Sua S^{tà} che nissun'haverebbe male che non l'havesse più che meritato; et si ragionò qualche poco poi del concilio, che tant'è sollicitato di Franza e Spagna; ma per commodità loro et d'Alemagna lo voriano a Bizansone; ma si crede che serà a Trento, perche li signori Venetiani non lo voriano nè a Bergamo nè a Vicenza, come ben havrebbe voluto S. S^{tà}. Si dice ch'i presidenti del concilio saranno il Morone, Santa Croce, et Sua S^{tà} dice tuttavia di voler alla fin d'agosto andar a Bologna. Di far cardinali non s'ha parlato per li disturbi ch'hanno dato le cose di Caraffi; pur non può tardare che non ne facci almanco 4. . . .

---

[1] See *supra*, pp. 143, 178.

[Orig. Urb. 1039 p. 165^{b}—167. Vatican Library.]

8. MOTUPROPRIO OF POPE PIUS IV. CONCERNING THE TRIAL OF THE CARAFA.[1]

1560, Juli 1, Roma.

Pius papa IIII^{s}.

Motu proprio etc. Cum ad aures nostras plurimorum fidedignorum relatione, non sine gravi animi nostri molestia, pervenerit, Ioannem Carafam, ducem Paliani et militem

---

[1] *Cf. supra*, p. 147, n. 2.

militie S^{ti} Michaelis, quam plura et varia crimina, etiam atrocia, perpetrasse et inter cetera quondam Marcellum Capicium eius nepotem seu alias consanguineum aut affinem, nullis prorsus precedentibus iuditiis, absque ullo pro cessu et figura iuditii, absque etiam notaria et sine aliqua penitus scriptura, temerario ausu et odio quo illum prosequebatur, questionibus et tormentis supposuisse ac demum quam pluribus vulneribus affectum crudeliter, etiam sepius per illum petita forsan sacramentali confessione et illi denegata, interfecisse, illiusque cadaver in latrinam deiecisse, multoque fimo superiniecto, ne facile detegi posset, cooperiri, et quondam Violantem uxorem suam, mulierem nobilem et in primis pudicam optimeque apud omnes opinionis et fame, ex ipso pregnantem in sexto vel septimo mense existentem, per eiusdem Violantis fratrem germanum et alium eius consanguineum vel affinem, ab ea prius quam in privato carcere per mensem et ultra detinuerat seu detineri fererat, certis gemmis et iocalibus extortis, opprobriose strangulari mandasse et fecisse, ac dudum antea quendam curie burgi executorem ob id quod quandam executionem sibi a iudice demandatam, ut ex officii necessitate tenebatur, fecisset, propriis manibus occidisse ; necnon Carolum Carafam et Alfonsum Neapolitanos vulgariter nuncupatos S. R. E. diaconos cardinales, propriae salutis ac dignitatis prosus immemores, in necem dictae Violantis eorum fratris et patrui respective uxoris[1] conspirasse, illamque necari mandasse, suasisse vel alias sollicitasse et ob eorum mandata, suasionem vel sollicitationem huiusmodi illius necem subsecutam fuisse. Insuperque Carolum cardinalem antea quam plura homicidia et enormia et multipliciter qualificata, etiam mediante pecunia, propriis manibus commisisse et seu committi fecisse aut mandasse et, quod omnium deterius est fel. rec. Paulum papam IV. predecessorem nostrum nihil magis quam pacem inter christianos principes inire et conservare satagentem, utpote qui admodum ipsi Carolo cardinali credebat, sub diversis confictis pretextibus et exquisitis falsis coloribus ac mendaciis variisque dolis et machinationibus decepisse, sicque ad ineundum bellum, ex quo innumera homicidia, sacrilegia, incendia, stupra, rapine aliaque toti reipublice christiane incommoda et damna sequuta fuerunt, induxisse, et tam ipsum Carolum cardinalem quam dictum ducem Antonium Carafam ipsorum fratrem in stipendiis militum S. R. E. eundem Paulum predecessorem et Cameram Apostolicam in ingenti et notabili pecuniarum summa defraudasse, et ex hoc etiam almam Urbem nostram totumque statum ecclesiasticum maximo periculo ob militum carentiam et defectum supposuisse; eosdemque Carolum cardinalem et Ioannem ducem quam plura adulteria et stupra mulierum, que renitentes erant, viros, fratres et parentes minis terrendo et carcerari faciendo vel alias vim inferendo, commisisse, et sub clipeo multos innocentes pro eorum libito ultimo supplicio tradi, ad triremes transmitti aliisque penis affici iussisse et effecisse; ac eosdem dictumque etiam Alfonsum cardinalem in omnibus provinciis status ecclesiastici quam plurimas extorsiones fecisse illasque et earum incolas ac etiam Cameram Apostolicam respective expilasse et defraudasse ac fieri expilari et defraudari mandasse eundemque Alfonsum cardinalem, qui alias ex sibi commisso regentis Camere officio, de quo fideliter exercendo in manibus eiusdem predecessoris iuramentum prestiterat, omnia ad eandem Cameram Apostolicam pertinentia non minus diligenter quam fideliter custodire tenebatur, in obitu predicti Pauli predecessoris ex ipsius cubiculo valde magnam et notabilem pecuniarum summam, gemmas, argenta, vasa usibus etiam ecclesiasticis et divino cultui dicata aliaque preciosa ingentis valoris subtraxisse, et monitorio generali, sub certis censuris et penis, ut, si qui de bonis ad Cameram predictam spectantibus aliqua haberent, illa denunciarent et restituerent, in vim litterarum a nobis emanatarum edito et publicato, penitus spreto, censuras et penas in illo contentas damnabiliter incurrendo, minime restituere voluisse litterasque in forma brevis sub eiusdem Pauli predecessoris nomine, quibus illa sibi per eundem Paulum predecessorem donata esse contineri asserebatur, falso fabricari fecisse et seu fabricasse aut saltem in eisdem literis falsitatem admisisse seu de ipsius mandato commissam fuisse, ipsosque cardinales et ducem alia etiam varia crimina et delicta, etiam falsitates et testium subornationem commisisse seu committi et patrari fecisse, suasisse vel mandasse. Nos, non valentes premissa, non solum ex assidua plurimorum relatione, sed etiam ex vehementi publica fama ac per modum quodammodo notorii ad nostram notitiam deducta, pro nostri officii debito non sine maximo totius orbis et Ecclesie scandalo conniventibus oculis pertransire, in primis predictos cardinales et ducem, de quorum fuga, si informationes de premissis coram notario recepte fuissent, maxime verendum erat, in arce nostra S^ti^ Angeli detrudi iussimus et deinde venerabili fratri Hieronimo episcopo Sagenensi alme Urbis nostre gubernatori et vicecamerario ut super premissis diligenter inquireret ac quoscunque, etiam episcopali dignitate fungentes, de premissis ac aliis eorundem ducis et cardinalium excessibus et delictis informatos examinaret, vive vocis oraculo commisimus et mandavimus; qui de mandato nostro huiusmodi super eis inquirere et quamplures etiam circa premissa complices examinare incepit et examinavit. Ne autem de viribus processus per eum hactenus desuper habiti et imposterum habendi hesitari contingat, motu simili et ex certa scientia eidem Hieronimo gubernatori per presentes committimus et mandamus ut super premissis omnibus et singulis aliisque in processu deductis et deducendis contra supradictos cardinales et ducem ac omnes alios et singulos quoscunque etiam episcopali vel alia dignitate preditos in eodem processu relatos eadem auctoritate diligenter inquireret, personis cardinalium dumtaxat exceptis, quos non nisi cum assistentia nonnullorum ex venerabilibus fratribus nostris eiusdem S. R. E. cardinalibus, ad id per nos deputatorum seu deputandorum, examinari et quod contra eos repertum fuerit nobis, ut quid de eis statuendum sit deliberare possimus, per eundem gubernatorem referri volumus, in reliquis causam et causas huiusmodi cum omnibus et singulis earum incidentibus, dependentiis, emergentiis, annexis et connexis iuxta facultates suas ordinarias et stilum sue curie audiat, cognoscat et pro iusticia terminet atque decidat. Dantes ei potestatem et facultatem quoscunque etiam dicta episcopali dignitate insignitos citandi et quibus et quotiens opus fuerit inhibendi, et pro veritate comperienda quascunque personas, etiam ecclesiasticas et ut prefertur qualificatas, ad subiiciendum se examini etiam per censuras ecclesiasticas aliaque iuris et facti remedia opportuna, prout iuris fuerit, cogendi et compellendi et absque eo quod persone huiusmodi aliquam propterea irregularitatem incurrant, quam illas nullatenus incurrere volumus et declaramus, axaminandi, et delinquentes quos culpabiles repererit presentes debitis penis etiam ultimi suplicii puniendi, absentes vero, etiam si dignitate episcopali prediti existant, habitis contra eos etiam extraiudicialiter iuditiis, arbitrio suo quantum sibi sufficere videbitur, constito sibi presertim extraiudicialiter de illorum ab Urbe et Romana curia fuga et recessu vel alias ipsorum latitatione, etiam per edictum ad valvas sue curie et in acie Campiflore affigendum, ad comparendum coram eo personaliter et non per procuratorem seu excusatorem aliquem intra terminum per eum prefigendum, et se ab obiectis et obiiciendis excessibus, criminibus et delictis expurgandum et excusandum, ac cum dilecto filio Alexandro Palanterio nostro Camere Apostolice procuratore fiscali iuri standum, sub excommunicationis maioris, suspensionis a divinis et ingressus ecclesie, privationis ecclesiarum et cathedralium, dignitatum et beneficiorum, pensionum annuarum et fractuum reservationum et officiorum ac feudorum et dominiorum utilium et temporalium aliorumque bonorum omnium confiscationis et corporalibus etiam ultimi supplicii et aliis etiam pecuniariis eius arbitrio imponendis penis, monendi et requirendi, et si non comparuerint seu etiam si comparuerint et se ab obiectis excessibus, criminibus et delictis legitime non expurgaverint, servatis quatuor terminis in similibus servari solitis, censuras et penas predictas incurrisse declarandi, aggravandi, reaggravandi, interdicendi et contra eos brachium seculare invocandi aliaque omnia et singula faciendi et exequendi in premissis et circa ea necessaria [sic] seu quomodolibet opportuna, non obstantibus constitutionibus et ordinationibus apostolicis ac privilegiis, indultis, litteris apostolicis, dignitate ducali dicteque militie sancti Michaelis et illius militibus ac S. R. E. cardinalibus, etiam per capitula in proximo preterito conclavi, in quo nos ad summi apostolatus apicem assumpti fuimus, firmatis, concessis, confirmatis et innovatis, quibus omnibus, illorum tenores etc., quoad premissa dumtaxat specialiter et expresse derogamus, stilo palatii caterisque contrariis quibuscunque statum et merita cause et causarum huiusmodi delinquentium nomina, cognomina, dignitates et numerum delictorum, species, qualitates et circumstancias ceterorumque premissorum ac aliorum forsan necessario vel magis specifice exprimendorum tenores et compendia pro sufficienter expressis habentes.

---

[1] Ms : uxorem.

[Manu Pontificis] Placet et ita motu proprio committimus et mandamus.

Presentetur. B. Amerinus Regens.
[Foris] Prima iulii 1560 Nicolaus de Matheis.
Prima iulii 1560 Hieronimo Sagonensi gubernatori.

Gubernatore—Romana excessuum pro Fisco; contra R^mos^ Cardinales Carafa et Neapolitanum ac ill^mum^ ducem Paliani et alios. Die 1 iulii 1560.

Aloysius de Ruere notarius actuarius.

[Orig. Miscell. X 197 p. 492 *seq.* Papal Secret Archives.]

9—10. MARCANTONIO DA MULA TO VENICE.[1]

1560, August 24, Rom.

La materia dei Caraffi, trattata con tanta diligenza et sollicitudine, com'ho più volte scritto, è più a cuore a Sua Santità ch'ogni altra; et s' è giustificata la mano del marchese Alberto et suo sigillo da persone prattiche, et ogni dì mattina e sera si sono ridotti, et parve al cardinale della causa spagnuola di dire parole e molto libere al cardinale Caraffa, che saria meglio per lui, essendo hormai convinto com'è et non potendo fuggire la condannatione, rimettersi nella pura misericordia del pontefice, et non più stare sopra negative che non li giovano, ma mandare a chiamare due teologhi huomini da bene che l'inducessero a pensare all'anima sua et non più alle cose di questo mondo. Il che dalli altri cardinali, ch'erano presenti, fu in un certo modo ripreso, et il card Caraffa con grand'impeto si dolse et esclamò, assai displorando la miseria sua et l'ingiustitia che diceva esserli fatta. Poi esso cardinale mandò a dire al pontefice ch'egli era stato huomo dal bel mondo et soldato et haveva fatto del male assai a'suoi dì, et se egli meritava perder la robba, la vita e l'honore, stimava più l'honore ch' ogn'altra cosa, et raccommandavasi humilmente a Sua S^tà^ dicendo che pativa e molto del vivere et non haveva più il modo; et Sua Santità gli mandò a rispondere che non haveva alcun male che lui medesimo non l'havesse procurato.

[Copy. Court Library, Vienna, *seq.* 6749 p. 402.]

11. MARCANTONIO DA MULA TO VENICE.[2]

1560, October 26, Rom.

Manderò il plico per Spagna ricevuto con le lettere di V. Ser^tà^ il 19, e non potei hieri haver l'audienza da S. S^tà^, com' è l'ordinario, perche la mattina fu consistoro et ella suole sempre uscirne tardi et esser stanca, et mi fece sapere ch'io andassi questa mattina; e buono fu ch'io non andassi hieri, perche l'haverei ritrovata alquanto alterata, perche hieri mattina in principio del concistoro il card^{le} di Carpi si fece innanzi a S. S^{tà} e chiamati alcuni altri cardinali, le parlò in presenza sua a favore de' Caraffi domandando termine, dilationi et giustitia. Ond'il pontefice si alterò e chiamò tutti l'altri cardinali e fece ch'il card^{le} di Carpi repplicò la sua instanza e poi cominciò a dire che sapeva che si negasse giustitia, termine, dilationi, e longamente riprese esso card^{le} di Carpi con parole pungenti.

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 152, n. 1.

[2] See *supra*, p. 156 n. 2,

Il card^{le} si scusava e replicava giustitia, onde il rumore fu assai grande, e però si fecero poche facenda in concistero, se non che furono spediti alcuni vescovati in Francia, e circa essi Caraffi si vanno formando le diffese del cardinale e quelle del card^{le} di Napoli ancora non si sono date, et alcuni dicono che le oppositioni non sono così gravi come si diceva da prima, scusandosi il card^{le} in tutto sopra la volontà del papa suo zio. . . . .

[Copy; Court Library, Vienna.]

12. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua.[1]

1561, February 22, Rom.

. . . Il duca di Paliano per quanto si dice è ridotto a tanta miseria che non ha che magnare, et sono due o tre dì, che un'altro prigionato gli prestò 5 scudi, non havendo egli dove sovenirsi. Sono intrati in Roma questi dì secretamente soldati ben armati, ma nissuno sa a che effetto, et pare che chiedutane la causa da N. S. ci habbia sol detto, eh, non è niente, non di meno questi dì si sparse fama che era stata trovata una poliza, la qual fu portata a S. S^{tà} et in essa se gli dava aviso che gente armata dovea venire a forte de Nona et mentre che ciascuno stava occupato in quei bagordi del carnevale dovea andare a levare per forza il duca di Palliano de forte de Nona, per il che all'hora fu levato de là et ridotto in Castello, et pare che dai birri siano stati detenuti et si trovino colpevoli di non so che, et de qui anco naschi la fretta che si fa di spedire la causa, tuttavia si vederà il fine. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

---

[1] See *supra*, pp. 158, n. 2, 162 n. 2.

13. CONSISTORY OF 3 MARCH, 1561.[1]

. . . Deinde vero Sua S^{tàs}, instante domino Alexandro Pallanterio procuratore fiscali, mandavit domino Hieronymo de Federicis episcopo Sagonensi, gubernatori Urbis, ut referret processum causae contra cardinalem Carafam; qui obediendo Suae Sanctitati retulit: duravitque relatio ab hora decima septima ad vigesimam quartam. Post quam quidem relationem Sua S^{tàs} pronuntiavit prout in cedula et terminavit consistorium.

Iulius card. Perusinus [camerarius.]

[Copy. Acta consist. Camer. IX, 38. Consistorial archives of the Vatican.]

14. FRANCESCO TONINA TO THE DUKE OF MANTUA.[2]

1561, March 5, Rome.

. . . Il dì del concistoro il card^{le} Caraffa tanto si perse che non potea parlare, hora dicono essere stata intimata a tutti la morte, et che detto Card^{le} non parla ad alcuno, se non che urla a modo di animale. Il conte di Aliffa si voleva amazzare, ma gli hanno poste le guardie. Don Lonardo non si può aquietare, tuttavia vi sono seco li capucini confortatori. N. S. deve partire se no dimani o l'altro, almeno lunidì certo per Civita Vecchia, et la sera inanti si farà la essecutione. Il duca di Palliano prega solo d' essere ispedito presto. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

15. POPE PIUS IV. TO HANNIBAL VON HOHENEMS.[3]

1561, March 5, Roma.

Brief with the following autograph postscript by the Pope: Voi non doveti instare che el Re vi mandi, anci se vi vole mandar doveti far ogni cosa per excusarvi, se pero questa letera vi trovasse in viaggio et che havesti comissioni importanti di Sua M^{tà} non vi levammo la faculta del [erasure] maravigliammo anchora che [defect in the paper] habbiati scritto in quel modo in favore de Caraffa, attento che Sua M^{tà} ne ha scritto in una altera manera et con altri rispetti. Cacciate [via] Avanzino et non impedite la g[ra]tia de li Borromei et por[tate] ve bene.

[Orig. Hohenems Archives.]

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 166 [2] See *supra*, p. 166. [3] See *supra*, p. 104. n. 2.

16. MARCANTONIO DA MULA TO VENICE.[1]

1561, March 7, Roma.

Lunedi fu concistoro, il quale si ridusse la mattina a buon hora e durò fino a due hore di notte. Si lesse il processo del cardinal Caraffa e la causa fu trattata per il governadore, intendo, con molta vehemenza ; al quale il cardinal di Ferrara rispose come quello che sapeva il tutto in materia delle cose di Francia e della guerra fu ascoltato, e tutti i cardinali intercessero ; ma non valse, perche il pontefice disse che voleva far giustitia, e pronuntiava la sentenza prout in cedula, dando al governatore una polizza bollata, e commandandoli che non la dovesse aprire fino ad altro ordine suo, e questa conteneva la sentenza ; et il giorno seguente il governatore si ridusse col fiscale et i suoi giudici, et espedirono i laici, cioè il duca di Palliano, il conte di Alife suo cognato, il sig^r^ conte Leonardo di Cardine ; ma non si sapeva come fosse l'espedition loro ; si dubitava male, per le parole che disse Sua Santità in concistoro, onde poi il mercore il sig^r^ Vargas si dolse con S. S^tà^ che volesse mettere in si puoco conto le raccomandationi del serenissimo re cattolico, che intercedeva per li signori Caraffi, come scrissi che faceva per l'ultimo spaccio, e Sua Santità gli rispose che voleva far giustitia ad ogni modo, se ben fosse anco contro il re Filippo.

La notte poi del mercore medesimo ad hore quattro entrorno i barigelli in Castello et andati alle stanze del duca di Palliano, gli dissero che lo volevano menare a Civita Vecchia, et egli, vedutosi che lo volevano far morire, gli disse che non conveniva che procedessero con lui in tal modo, per che era pronto a morire, ma desiderava haver tanto tempo che potesse scrivere una lettera al suo figliuolo : e cosi gli portorno da scrivere e la copia mando qui inclusa.

Fornito di scrivere, prese in mano un crocefisso et una candela benedetta accesa e, doppo dette alcune orationi, andò alle stanze del conte di Alife suo cognato col crocefisso e la candela in mano e, salutatolo, disse : Fratello, andiamo di buona voglia, bisogna morire, anzi andare alla vita, esortandolo con tal sorte di parole che intendo che non si poteva dir le più belle nè le più christiane ; e con lui andò alle stanze del sig^r^ Leonardo di Cardine, et essortato ancor lui con efficacia a morire volontieri et consolatolo, furono menati tutti e tre fuori di Castello in Torre di Nona, dove furono decapitati, morendo tutti christianissimamente.

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 170.

Poi ritornati i barigelli[1] in Castello, che potevano essere le cinque hore di notte, andorno alle stanze del cardinal Caraffa, il quale non sapeva niente di questo fatto, e destatolo, perche dormiva, disse uno de'barigelli: Monsignore, piace a Dio et al papa che dobbiate morire adesso adesso, però disponetevi. Il cardinale interruppe e disse: Morire? replicando due volte questa parola con admiratione; et alcuni dicono che disse di più: Come deve morire uno che non è confessato nè convinto? Ma datemi da vestire, e fate almeno che mi possa confessare. Il barigello rispose: Se vi volete confessare, è qui un frate per questo, che vi attenderà; e contentandosi il cardinale che venisse, si finì di vestire sino al saio e domandando la cappa da cardinale e la berretta, dissero che havevano ordine di non gliela dare. Si lavò le mani, si confessò, disse l'ufficio della Madonna e i sette salmi, inginocchiatosi con le mani gionte, disse: Fate il vostro ufficio, e direte al governatore et al fiscale che gli perdono; e così, messoli un laccio nuovo al collo per strangolarlo, si ruppe il laccio, et egli, levatosi in piedi, disse: Ah traditori, perchè mi stentate a questo modo? Poi tornatosi ad inginocchiare, gliene posero un altro, il quale anco si ruppe; ma egli non potendosi più levare et essendo ancor vivo, lo finirono con un lenzuolo del suo letto e lo portorno subito alla chiesa della Traspontina a seppellire, e potevano essere nove hore incirca.

La mattina poi per tempo furono posti i corpi degl' altri in Ponte con alquante torice, il duca in un cataletto coperto di un panno di velluto colle armi de' Caraffi e quella della madre dalla parte destra; il conte dalla sinistra il sig^{r} don Leonardo [su] due tappeti in terra, con tanto concorso di popolo che ruppero fino il cataletto e gl'inciamporno addosso per la calca; e fu forza, quando gli volsero lavar via, che potevano essere quindici hore, portare un altro cataletto: et erano tutti calpestati et infangati, perche piovette dal principio di questo fatto fino che furono seppelliti.

Il popolo minuto e grande biasimano il pontefice per troppo severo, massime nella morte del cardinale e nella sepoltura die tre, havendoli fatti portare di Ponte con scuola della Misericordia fino a S. Giovanni decollato, dove portano

---

[1] This account is wrong. The Cardinal was executed first. See the *report of Tonina which follows in No. 17.

ogni sorte di giustitiati; di dove i parenti gli hanno poi tolti e portati altrove a seppellire in secreto.
[Copy. Miscell. III. 24 p. 493-497. Papal Secret Archives.]

17. FRANCESCO TONINA TO THE DUKE OF MANTUA.[1]

1561, March 8, Roma.

. . . È finalmente finita questa tragedia Carafesca. Mercori alle cinque hore di notte andò il barigello Gasparino[2] (come egli stesso ha narrato di bocca) primieramente al card^{le} Caraffa, il quale dormeva supino, et benchè già gli era stata notitiata la morte, come per la precedente mia scrissi a V. Ecc^{a}, non di meno non poteva pur crederlo, et così entrato in camera, gli disse quello che era venuto a fare, il che era per far esseguire quel tanto che era di mente di N. S. in farlo morire, al che ci dice, che detto card^{le} rispose per dieci volte, io morire? adunque il Papa vuole che io muoia? Et finalmente chiarito che questa era l'ultima hora, et che se non attendeva a confessaris et accomodare li casi fuoi fra quel poco di tempo che ad esso bargello era stato statuito per fare l'essecutione egli senz' altro aspettare haveria fatto esseguire la commissione sua, anchor che più volte replicasse, io che non ho confessato cosa alcuna, morire? si dispose poi a confessarsi, il che fatto, chiamò tutti gli astanti et li disse, siate testimoni, come io perdono al Papa, al Re di Spagna et al governadore et fiscale et altri nemici miei, poi postolo a sedere sopra una scragna li pose il carnefice il capestro al collo, et dopo haverlo fatto molto stentare lo finì pur al ultimo di strangolare. Andorno poi al duca di Palliano, qual condussero in Torre di Nona et nel discendere dalla prigione di Castel S^{to} Angelo, dimandò dove lo conducevano, et allora il bargello non gli volse dire che lo conducessero a far morire, ma sol gli disse che lo conduceva in Torre di Nona, et più oltre non sapea sin a quella hora. Al che detto duca rispose, che ben sapea che lo conducevano alla morte, che Christo glielo havea rivelato, et che di gratia gli lasciassero scrivere una lettera al figliolo Così ridottosi nella camera dove sta prigione con sigurtà di non far fuga Giovanni de Nepi, interessato anch' egli in questo negotio, esso duca scrisse le due lettere che V. Ecc.

---

[1] See *supra*, pp. 170, 172.

[2] Gasparinus de Melis, named barisellus in alma Urbe in the brief of March 20 1557. Min brev. Arm. 42 t. 12, n. 95 Papal Secret Archives. *Cf.* RODOCANACHI, St. Ange, 167.

vederà con questa alligate, l'altra alla sorella, le quali sono veramente christiane, poi fu condutto a Torre di Nona, dove a lui et il conte di Aliffa et don Leonardo di Cardine fu troncata la testa. Morì il duca dispostissimo, eccetto che nell'istesso voler porre il capo sotto il ceppo o tagliuola, cominciò a dire, aiutatime de gratia tentatione, abrenuntio Satanae, et finalmente fu ispedito; il conte d'Aliffa si dice che ragionava anch' egli alcune parole christiane, pur era fuor di se. Don Leonardo di Cardine mori finalmente disposto. Delli corpi loro segui questo. Il card^{le} fu portato nella chiesa Transpontina, il duca et il conte et D. Leonardo furno portati la mattina per tempo in Ponte, il duca in cadaletto piccolo et assai miserabile, ove giaceva con una veste di pelle in torno con due torze rosse, una per ciascun capo, il conte d'Aliffa et D. Leonardo erano coricati in terra su due miserabili tapeti, longhi dui brazzi o circa, et poi tutti infangati et calpestrati dal numero delle genti che andavano a vedere. Il card^{le} è stato portato poi a sepellire alla Minerva, et si nice anco del duca, gli altri dui dicono che li parenti trattavano di condurgli a Napoli. Del card^{le} di Napoli si spera universalmente poco bene, ma di Pisa si tiene da tutti del sicuro pessimo fine. Di Monte non si sa quello ch'habbia a seguire, ma non se ne spera anco bene alcuno. Havea detto N. S. di voler andare a Civita Vecchia, ma sin qui non vi è segno alcuno. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

18. AVVISO DI ROMA OF 8 MARCH, 1561.[1]

Di Roma li 8 marzo 1561. Lunedi si fece concistero sopra le cose de Caraffi, che durò 8 hore di continove et passata un hora di notte si finì et vi fu letto un summario del processo di Caraffa dal governatore; et letto che fu, Sua S^{tà} diede la sententia et pronunciò prout in cedula contra Caraffa et fatto questo si levorono li rev^{mi} Carpi, Ferrara, Farnese, Crispo, Augusta et altri, et andavano da Sua S^{tà} supplicandolo a volere usare qualche misericordia verso il cardinale et non punirlo secondo li demeriti suoi, massime per esser del sacro collegio, che è grado più eccellente in christianità; alli Sua S^{tà} rispose che a tanti enormi delitti non si poteva trovar luoco di clementia et che a levare li scelerati fuor di quel collegio non ne poteva succedere se non honore. Et così la notte del mercordi circa a hore 6 fu mandato in Castello solo il barigello havendo seco il boia ad anuntiarli la morte così al duca di Paliano suo fratello et al conte d'Aliffe et a Lunardo di Cardine.

---

[1] See *supra*, pp. 178 *seq.*

Il cardinale dormiva et svegliato dal barigello facendoli intendere c'haveva a morire rispose: io ho a morire, et replicatosi che si, alzò la voce et disse: ò Re Philippo, ò Papa Pio, et poco di poi havendo dimandato a vestire volendosi metter una veste et la baretta da cardinale, gli fu detto che non lo facesse et vestitosi dimandò il confessore et confessatosi disse i sette salmi et altre orationi passeggiando et alle volte ingenocchiandosi et finite le orationi disse sitio chiedendo de l'acqua et beve, tenendo poi stretto et abbracciato un quadro di Nostra Donna, pregando che quello fusse poi dato a sua sorella et postosi di poi a sedere si voltò alli ministri della giustitia et disse, se da me non volete altro, fatte quello c'havete a far et fatte presto. Il laccio, col quale il boia gli stringeva la gola, si ruppe per maggior pena et fu necessario torne un altro col quale fu strangolato et fatto finir di morire et il corpo suo involto in uno linzuolo fu portato a sepelire in S. Maria Transpontina. Fu fatto poi intendere al duca di Paliano che ivi era venuto il barigello, et levatosi ringratiò Iddio poi che era giunto al fine delle sua miserie, poi dimandò del cardinale suo fratello et gli fu risposto che n'era bene et ne laudò et ringratiò Iddio; tolto poi in mano un crusifisso s'inviò verso Torre di Nona, confortando sempre gli altri dui et facendo loro animo et bellissime parole fino a quel punto che misse il collo sul ceppo, onde tutti li circonstanti lagrimavano et cosi furono tutti 3 decapitati et li corpi loro con le teste portati su la piazza di Ponte s. Angelo et furono posti vicino al Ponte verso Torre di Nona, quello del duca sopra uno cataletto con 2 torcie accese et quelli del conte d'Aliffe et di don Lunardo di Cardine sopra la terra nuda presso a pie del cataletto, et poi portati tutti 3 a sepelire di quel modo et di quello luogo che si portono a sepelire i ladri et assassini che morono per giustitia con i sbirri dietro per scorta et questo è stata l'ultimo fin loro. Il Papa disse la matina seguente al card. Borromeo, chel caso di costoro havava da essere de gran documento a lui et che quando egli facesse il quarto delle cose che essi havevano fatto, pregava Iddio che fusse fatto a lui come a loro. Questa notte passata a hora 5 fue cavato d'una sepoltura il card. Caraffa et accompagnato da 4 frati de quelli della Traspontina, ove era sepolto, fue portato alla Minerva. Hora vi sono li 3 cardinali pregioni, cioè Napoli, Monte et Pisa che di loro si ne fa malissimo giudicio, massime di Pisa che de lui si dubita più che delli altri.

Di Venetia alli 14 marzo 1561. V. Stopio.

On the reverse: Al Ulrico Fuccari Augusta.

[Orig. Urb. 1039, p. 258^b—259. Vatican Library.]

19. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua.[1]

Roma, 1561, December 3.

. . . Di Franza non si ha da poi più altro, ma si crede che habbino poca voglia di concilio, li capi et nel generale. Per contrario la S^{tà} di N. S. per ogni modo vuole ch' esso concilio si faccia, et da persona che lo può sapere, intendo che ha havuto a dire, faciamo pur il concilio et poi pensaremo alla esecutione, come che habbi in animo finito quello di provedere poi per altra via alle heresie. Questa sera intorno a un hora di notte o circa con un pessimo aere, che si trovava, egli era sopra li corridori che vanno da palazzo a Castello, a lume di torze, ne pare che temi cosa alcuna, tanto è robusto in questa sua vecchiezza. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

20. Avviso di Roma of 6th December, 1561.[2]

. . . Sua S^{tà} parlò della riforma [nel concistoro di hieri] che pur li sta tuttavia nel core, dicendo che voleva esser lei la prima a porvi la mano, et massimamente nella corte, dove li pareva non esser ragionevole che il concistoro nè altri vi ponessero la mano, et che perhò voleva far una bulla sopra le cose della sede vacante, nel qual tempo si faceva cose assai che apportavano scandali ; et disse di voler limitare l' autorità del camerlengo per quel tempo, non li parendo honesto che egli potesse liberar banditi o confinati in galea, nè far salvo condutti et far pagar debiti della Sede Apostolica senza il consenso di tutto il collegio ; et de simil facultà che tiene et anche circa la Penitentiaria che la faceva alcune cose che non stanno bene; et disse che voleva che il conclave in sede vacante si dovesse far in Castello et che la elettione passasse per bollotatione et non per via de voti con pollize. Ma di questo ultimo non fece ferma deliberatione, per che S. S$^{\text{tà}}$ manderà la bulla a tutti cardinali ad un per uno per poter dir il lor parere. . . . Sua Santità è stata per 2 o 3 dì molto ristretta con li rev$^{\text{mi}}$ Alessandrino et Trani sopra le cose della riforma; ma non s' intende che sia conclusa cosa veruna: ben si dubitava che dovesse uscire una bulla che ogniuno andasse alle parocchiali et cure che hanno. . . .

---

[1] See *supra*, pp. 87, 262.

[2] See *supra*, p. 279

Il negocio della reformatione della Penetentiaria S. S$^{\text{tà}}$ ha rimessa la consideratione alli rev$^{\text{mi}}$ San Clemente et Vitello con doi altri prelati, et la reformation del Datariato ha rimesso alli rev$^{\text{mi}}$ S$^{\text{tà}}$ Fiore et S. Angelo.

[Orig. Urb. 1039 p. 317$^{\text{b}}$, Vatican Library.]

21. AVVISO DI ROMA OF 13TH DECEMBER, 1561.[1]

. . . Giovedì si fece la solita congregatione nanti il papa, nella quale si trattò la cosa della riforma et del concilio; ma fin qui non è determinato niente, perche a cardinali non è parso conveniente che tanti illust$^{\text{mi}}$ et reverend$^{\text{mi}}$ si riduchino sotto la custodia d' un solo castellano, ne gli è piaciuta la proposta della diminutione del vivere et riduttione a pane et acqua, se fra tanto tempo non s' accordassero a fare il papa nel castello di S$^{\text{to}}$ Angelo, dicendo che sarebbe assai quando si riducessero a far vita de frati, e disse Sua S$^{\text{tà}}$ che non era bene che nissun cardinale tenesse più d' un cocchio et che in esso si potesse andare ad alcun atto publico nè tornare, ma sopra li loro muli et con le solite cavalcate; et furono fatti diversi altri ragionamenti et discorsi pur senza conclusione.

[Orig. Urb. 1039, p. 325$^{\text{b}}$, Vatican Library.]

22. AVVISO DI ROMA OF 20TH DECEMBER, 1561.[2]

. . . Le bolle della riforma delli ecclesiastici et del conclave va[nno] intorno fra questi rev$^{\text{mi}}$, et già il rev$^{\text{mo}}$ Carpi l' ha sottoscritta, cosa che si pensava non dovesse fare così facilmente; et Sua S^{tà} l' ha data di sua man propria al rev^{mo} di Mantua suo zio, nella quale vuol S. S^{tà} [ad] ogni modo che la creatione si facci con ballottatione a usanza di Venetia.

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 279.
[2] See *supra*, p. 279.

[Orig. Urb. 1039 p. 319^{b}, Vatican Library.]

23. Avviso di Roma of 10th January, 1562.[1]

. . . Il giorno inanzi [lunedì passato vigilia della coronatione di S. S^{tà}] Sua Santità fece comandare sotto pena della sua disgratia, che nissun cameriero andasse per Roma se non in habito ecclesiastico, et così tutti gli altri beneficiati in habito di prete; et la riforma della corte, Penitentiaria, Datariato et del conclave va tuttavia intorno et starà poco a publicarsi. . . .

[Orig. Urb. 1039 p. 330, Vatican Library.]

24—33. Reforming Activity of Pius IV. from February to May, 1562.[2]

1. Avviso di Roma of 8th February, 1562.

On Monday the Pope issued a Motuproprio: all holders of benefices who are *in sacris* must, under pain of excommunicaion, wear the priestly dress (*sottana di sotti il ginocchio*).[3]

[Orig. Urb. 1039, p. 337, Vatican Library.]

2. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua.

1562, February 21, Rom.

. . . È uscito un motu proprio, che tutti che hanno beneficii o pensioni o siano in sacris vadino in habito et tonsura, et perchè si trovano de coqui, de staferi et altri più vili persone servitori de card^{li} che hanno beneficii et pensioni, alcuni card^{li} hanno fatto ricorso a S. B^{ne} perchè questo editto si moderasse et sopra questo è stata fatta congregatione, ma non solo N. S. non ha voluto moderar quello, ma hoggi ni è uscito un' altro che sotto l' istesse pene di escommunicatione, carceratione, pecuniarie ad arbitrio et della privatione de benefici, tutti habbino ubedito fra nove dì, altrimente si essequiranno le pene. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 279.

[2] *Cf. supra*, p. 279.

[3] In consequence of opposition the carrying out of the order had to be referred to the next consistory; see Arco in Kassowitz, XVII., n. 17.

3. Avviso di Roma of 7th March, 1562.]

Thursday, a Congregation of the Cardinals, in the presence of the Pope, concerning the reform of the Penitentiary, the greed of which must be restrained, " di che il card. S. Angelo [Ranuccio Farnese] si duole."

[Orig. Urb. 1039, p. 343^{b}. Vatican Library.]

4. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua.

1562, April 2, Rom.

. . . Hieri è stata congregatione nella quale fu disputato assai, se li card^{i} che hanno pensioni o benefici in Spagna doveranno contribuire alla concessione fatta alla M^{tà} Cath^{ca} delle 60 galere, et fu concluso che non. Hoggi è stata congregatione sopra le cose della Penitentiaria, la quale S. S^{tà} dimostro haver animo di ridurre a pochissima authorità, cosa che cede a molto danno del card^{le} S. Angelo, il qual pertanto dopo finita essa congregatione, nella quale sono intravenuti gli ufficiali principali di essa, si doleva et sbatteva assai, con alcuni altri card^{li}, pur converrà che habbi patienza, perchè è già un pezzo che S. B^{ne} ha questa voglia. Se dimani fa buon tempo (che questa sera è gran pioggia) S. S^{tà} havea desegnato di andare all' acqua di Salone, cioè a verdere quest' acqua, la quale è un vaso di bonissima acqua, che si è in opera per condurla a Roma, et sarà bastevole, senza bere più di quell del fiume, ma non sono ancora in essere li vasi, et vi sono qualche differenze. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

5. Avviso di Roma of 25th April, 1562.

The Pope is holding many congregations on reform, " ma non conclude niente ; " especially of the Dataria and Penitentiary, " che sono di grandissima importantia per gli offitii di Roma che sono fondate sopra l' intrate che si cavano dalle ispeditioni."

[Orig. Urb. 1039, p. 358^{b}. Vatican Library.]

6. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua.

1562, May 2, Roma.

. . . La S^{tà} de N. S. è così entrata alla riforma di questi uffici di Roma, che altro non si sente che stridi de gli ufficiali

di Penitentiaria et degli altri uffici, massime di Camera. Alla Penitentiaria si levano tutti le si in evidenti, che passino l' entrata di venti scudi et tutte le assolutioni da delitti, et tante altre authorità che havea che dire il card^{le} S. Angelo, che gli levano d' entrata più de cinque mila scudi l' anno. Al Camerlengo levano quasi tutta l' authorità et massime quella che havea in sede vacante, grandissima, et in maniera passano le cose, che quelli che hanno comprati già gli uffici per cinque, sei et sette mila scudi, hor si dariano voluntieri per due et tre. Ogni cosa si riduce alla Dataria, in maniera che molti mormorano che S. B^{ne} tiri l' acqua tutta al suo molino. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

7. Francesco Tonina to the Duke of Mantua.

1562, May 6, Roma.

. . . Non si sente altro qui de presente che parlare di riforma, ha S. B^{ne} levato gli accessi, regressi et coadiutorie et le confidenze, sopra il che si ha da publicare una bolla rigorosissima. Quella della riforma della Penitentiaria non è stata ancora mandata in publico, perchè ancorchè nel consitorio di luni prossimo passato S. B^{ne} dicesse espressamente alli r^{mi} card^{li} Cueva, Morone, Cesis et S. Clemente che gli parlorono per gli ufficiali che voleva che fusse com' era stabilita, non di meno ottennero che si soprasedesse il publicarla per certo poco. Parlò non di meno S. B^{ne} in presenza d' ogniuno molto chiaro che non voleva farsi altro, perchè gli dimandavano almeno qualche ricompenso et restoro della ruina che gli era delli ufficii loro. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

8. Avviso di Roma of 9th May, 1562.

Reform of the Cancellaria. Abolition of *vivae vocis oraculo per conto delle indulgentie,* which are generally to be granted but sparingly.

[Orig. Urb. 1039, p. 362. Vatican Library.]

9. Avviso di Roma of 16th May, 1562.

Yesterday a general congregation of all the Cardinals. A bull on the reform of the Penitentiary.

[Orig Urb. 1039, p. 363. Vatican Library.]

10. AVVISO DI ROMA OF 23RD MAY, 1562.

The bull for the reform of the Penitentiary appeared in print.

[Orig. Urb. 1039, p. 366. Vatican Library.]

34. FRANCESCO TONINA TO THE DUKE OF MANTUA.[1]

1564, April 22, Rom.

. . . Si ragiona assai per corte che detto r^{mo} Borromei sia dato tutto al spirito, et quasi a una vita theatina, della quale dubitando N. S., si dice anco che l' ha fatto eshortare a lasciar la pratica stretta che teneva de essi Theatini et a loro, che sotto pene non vi pratichino. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

35. FRANCESCO TONINA TO THE DUKE OF MANTUA.[2]

1564, April 29, Rom.

. . . Qui si ragiona che N. S. tiene molto dispiacere della stretta pratica che il r^{mo} Borromei ha tuttavia con questi Theatini, li quali dicono che S. S^{tà} dice che mirano alle intrate et beni, più che alla santità che di fuora mostrano et che con destro modo ha fatto sapere ad esso ill^{mo} Borromei quanto sarebbe il desiderio suo in ciò, con eshortarlo ad attendere alli negocii et carico che ha per non dar occasione a S. B^{ne} di far altra provisione come seria necessario per il cumulo de negoci di questa S^{tà} Sede. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

36. FRANCESCO TONINA TO THE DUKE OF MANTUA.[3]

1564, August 12, Rom.

. . . Di questo medico di S. B^{ne} ditenuto variamente si ragiona, et ancora che da molti sia detto che sia pur suspitione di veneno, laonde si dice che viene anco fatto processo con il card^{le} di Napoli, non di meno la cosa va tanto secreta che non si ne può penetrare di certezza il vero. S. B^{ne} si trova ancora a S. Apostolo, palazzo del s^{r} card^{le} Borromei in vita acquistato dal s. ill. Antonio Colona, et nel quale adesso si lavora in fabrica di molta spesa et va S. B^{ne} ad alto per sopra certi

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 119.

[2] See *supra*, p. 119.

[3] See *supra*, p. 87, n. 4, and Vol. XVI. of this work.

ponti che non sono anco molto sicuri et dove tuttavia cascano pietre et altre cose da muri. . . .

[Orig. Gonzaga Archives, Mantua.]

37. ONOFRIO PANVINIO AS BIOGRAPHER OF PIUS IV.

The fourth Pius is among those Popes who have not been made the subject of a long and full biography. He was not one of those outstanding personalities, such as a biographer delights in. Moreover, the closing period of the Council of Trent drew general attention to itself rather than to what was happening in Rome. The brief biographical sketch of Pius IV. which O. Panvinio added to his biographies of other Popes, is an instance of this. In this matter the veil has been drawn back by a German historian, who has won great renown by his history of Pius IV., namely, Giuseppe Šusta, in his splendid monograph published in Czech in the year 1900, under the title: Pius IV. prěd pontificátem a na počátku pontifikátu (Pius IV. before his pontificate down to its beginning). J. Goll wrote a spirited review of this work in the Abendpost of Vienna, 1902, Beilage n. 21, to which attention was drawn in the Histor. Zeitschrift, LXXXIX, 330. In spite of this, the results of the researches of Šusta have remained quite unnoticed among scholars. Even Merkle, who, in the second volume of his great collection of authorities called *Concilium Tridentinum*, devotes a very minute dissertation to the life and writings of Panvinio in their bearing on the Popes and conclaves during the Council, knows nothing of them. With the acumen which is characteristic of him, Šusta, in Appendix II, p. 159 *seqq.* submits to a critical examination the Vita Pii IV. of Panvinio, as it appears in the edition of 1568, which hitherto has been accepted, together with the Venetian reports, as the principal authority, and comes to the surprising conclusion that for Pius IV. Panvinio is by no means the safe guide that even Müller (Konklave Pius IV., 228, n. 242) thought him to be. In this case that fact comes out even more strongly, which, in speaking of the sources and authorities for the history of Paul IV. in the present work (Vol. XIV., 486 *seqq*), I established in the case of the Carafa Pope, namely that our historian has allowed himself to be very strongly biased in his account by the public opinion which was often very strong in the Curia, and by his own relations with his patron, Cardinal Alessandro Farnese.

The first edition of the Vita Pii IV. of Panvinio appeared in 1562 as an appendix to the new edition of Platina issued by the Cologne editor, Maternus Cholinus.[1] This very brief sketch (p. 340–342) the mere embryo of the later biography, went as far as the end of 1561; it is all rather colourless, and at times may be altogether discounted on account of its brevity. Thus, for example, according to this account we should be led to believe that Cardinal Medici remained in Rome during the whole of the pontificate of Paul IV. Although it does not lack the usual words of praise, of which the humanist writers were never sparing, it is nevertheless very far from being a panegyric. According to all appearances the thing was much felt at the Papal court. Above all it was bound to cause talk that a point so well known and discussed as the Florentine origin of the Medici of Milan was passed over in silence. As far as other defects were concerned, the haste used in its composition might have been urged as an excuse, but this omission implied an attack on the upstart. It is not difficult to understand what led Panvinio to act in this way. He who had had relations with the new Pope while he was still a Cardinal, found himself disappointed in his ambitious expectations when the Cardinal had been raised to the supreme dignity.[2] Šusta (p. 161) conjectures, and not without good grounds, that Panvinio's relations with Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, whose own relations with Pius IV. had become strained, helped to prepossess him against Pius IV. But in court circles, and indeed with Pius IV. himself, the attitude adopted by Panvinio could not be a matter of indifference, since an author who was so popular and gifted exercised a considerable influence on public opinion. It was thought well to win him over. Panvinio was given a position in the Vatican Library, with a monthly salary of ten ducats, in addition to a money present of 500 ducats.[3] He then wrote, with the greatest possible speed, a new Vita Pii IV. He received from the Pope himself by word of mouth, a justification of the condemnation of the Carafa,[1] to be included in his book. Besides this he received from the Pope's intimate friends certain "hints" which indicated a number of changes that might be introduced in his more detailed Vita. As a proof that Panvinio very willingly accommodated himself to these desires, Šusta refers, though very briefly, to the Cod. Vatic. lat. 6775, and to Cod. 122 of Arm. X of the Miscell. in the Papal Secret Archives. (*Emendanda, addenda vel demenda sine ulla contradictione et si opportuerit meis sumptibus in vita Pii IV. papae*). On account of the important bearing which this has upon the question of the independence of Panvinio, it will not be out of place to print here at least one of these "hints." It is to be found in Cod. Vatic. lat. 6775, Par. 2a, p. 155—166b, and runs as follows:

---

[1] *Cf.* SCHRORS in the Annalen des Hist. Vereins für den Niederrhein, LXXXV., Cologne, 1908, 150 *seq.*

[2] The 200 scudi given to Panvinio by Pius IV. was considered insufficient (see PERINI, O. Panvinio, Roma, 1899, 24, 219).

[3] See PERINI, 219; MERKLE, II., cxxvi.

Populari statu—Honorifico[2] potius, si Iovio credimus in vita Leonis X.

Pater Pii IV. Sequendo ordinem naturae et temporum et personarum, videtur prius facienda mentio avi, deinde patris, postea filiorum; et antequam nomen Pii IV exprimeretur, nuncupandus esset simpliciter Ioannes Angelus; deinde gradatim prout eius aucta est dignitas, immutandum nomen prothonotarii et archiepiscopi.

Medices—potius Mediceus.

Marignani—vulgare nimis et etiam depravatum; nam Melegnanum dictur vulgo. Latinior vox esset Melenianum.

Paschae—Paschatis potius, licet alii contra.

Paroeciae—cum a dictione graeca παρογος descendat, dicendum potius Parochia; licet Budaeus contra.

Hic commemorandum videtur illud praesagium flammae lambentis crines pueri dum noctu cum nutrice cubaret.

Iuri operam—prius philosophiae ac medicinae.

Consecutus est. Deinde in patriam reversus in iurisperitorum collegium cooptatus, aliquandiu farensi actioni inservivit,[3] cum assiduis bellis[4] exagitata patria pacate in ca degere non posset.

Publicis muneribus deinde affinitate.—Hic quoque servandus ordo videretur, ut primo recenserentur munera,

---

[1] See *supra*, p. 140.
[2] On the margin: illustri—claro.
[3] On the margin: se dedit.
[4] On the margin: bellorum turbinibus.

magistratus, provinciae quas ei delegavit Paulus III et quae singilatim enumerantur in praefatione; deinde collatio archiepiscopatus, affinitas, cardinalatus.

Praefuit Asculanis—contracte nimis; ideo aliquanto latius explicanda, praesertim ubi aliquid insigne edidit.

Alter marchio—hic addenda dictio quae indicet esse illum de quo supra.

Inique—hoc nimis aggravat factum Caesarianorum. Forte melius: quorundam aemulorum conspiratione.

Lites finibus—propius videtur: finium regundorum disceptator et arbiter.

Exercitus curator—Quaestor potius.

Parmam missis—Non misit, sed ivit, et quanquam nulla secum stipendia attulisset, opibus tamen amicorum, quos Parmae habuit, adiutus, valido praesidio urbem firmavit.

Novissime—Hic praecedere debet mentio affinitatis, archiepiscopatus Ragusin,, episcopatus Cassan.

Consilio ipsius et opera atque solertia.

Publica munera nulla attigit—aberrat a vero, quia sub Iulio III. et Paulo IV modo signaturae iustitae, modo gratiae, modo utrique praefuit.

Pauli IV severitas—omittendum, et praetereunda causa balneorum Lucensium et desiderii visendae fruendae patriae.

Avitis aedibus—Non erant avita, sed nova aedificia a fratre marchione coepta.

Vixit—addendum: nec tamen diem ullum praetermisit in quo litterariis studiis non incumberet, sic bonas horas consumendo.

Hic quoque vel alio in loco primum illud et liberale factum commemorandum videtur, cum fraternam adivisset haereditatem et dubitaret ne facta fratris, dum variis praefuit bellis, aliqui iacturam bonorum suorum fecissent, redditum annuum mille aureorum ex censu fraterno xenodochio seu, ut vocant, hospitali magno Mediolani concessit, ut ex eo primo resarcirentur damna passi, deinde pauperes infirmi alerentur; quin etiam propria sacerdotia satis ampli redditus eidem hospitali assignavit.

Existimatus est, tamen quam praecipue, cum Urbe inundatione Tyberis sub Paulo IV fame vexata, quicquid ipse in horreis ad familiae suae pro integro anno usum

considerat, liberaliter ad egenae plebis substentationem primis mensibus deprompsit.

Cardinalium ambitum, modestius ob varias dissensiones.

Alexandro Farnesio, Hippolyto a Ferr. omittenda, cum electio pontificis tam homini quam Deo accepta ferenda sit.

Qui laesi—qui alioqui laesi.

Florentiae, Allobroga—prius Allobroga.

Labefactorum—labefactum.

Ante omnia, ne videatur id ie profecto egisse ut quaecunque decreta Pauli IV subverteret, texenda est oratio ut appareat ob multorum querimonias qui se Pauli sanctionibus iniuste tractatos lamentabantur, coactum esse novum ius rescribere.

Evidently these "hints" come from somebody intimately acquainted with the daily life of Pius IV. Their nature is such that there can remain no doubt as to the aim with which they were drawn up. As soon as one looks at the second edition of the Vita Pii IV. which Panvinio composed, and which goes to the end of 1562, one must see that in it Panvinio has made use, in the most literal way, of almost all the "hints" with which he was provided.

Of this second edition Šusta was only acquainted with the précis in Cod. 122 of Arm. XI. of the Miscell. in the Papal Secret Archives. He was of opinion that it is not possible to decide for certain whether this second edition was ever published, as he had not been able to discover Latin editions of Platina from 1562 to 1568, but that the second edition was to be found in an Italian translation of Platina-Panvinio, which was published in Venice in 1563 by Michele Tramezino.[1] In this respect I am able to complete the researches of Šusta. I have before me: B. Platinae Historia de Vitis Pontificum Romanorum a D. N. Iesu Christo usque ad Paulum Papam II. longe quam antea emendatior, cui Onuphrii Panvinii Veronensis fratris Eremitae Augustiniani opera reliquorum quoque pontificum vitae usque ad Pium IIII, pontificem maximum adiunctae sunt. Venetiis, apud Michaelem Tramezinum. Anno 1562. There, p. 315b–319, may be found the Latin text of the second edition. At the begininng of this work there is a dedication by Panvinio to Pius IV. dated

---

[1] G. GAIDA, Platynae Historici Liber de vita Christi ac omnium pontificum, in the new edition by MURATORI, Rerum Ital. Scriptores fasc. 124, Città di Castello, 1913, p. xcvii, wo eine gute Ubersicht aller Ausgaben und Ubersetzungen des Platina-Panvinio, where there is a good account of all the editions and translations of Platina—Panvinio.

Romae kal. octobr. [October 1st] 1561[1], in which there is given as the reason for the edition the close approach of the Council. There is no lack of praise for the reigning Pope: "Cui enim aptius dicari de maximis pontificibus liber scriptus potuit, quam pontifici maximo? et ei pontifici, qui divinitus nobis in hac temporum hominumque pravitate datus est. Qui pietate, religione, iustitia, prudentia et humanitate, ecclesiae ipsi iam in senium vergenti et fere collapse pias manus porrigere et eam iacentem attollere rursum atque paene confectam restituere sua virtute et Dei beneficio et potest et vult." The whole of the new life is written in this sense. In the place of the dry and meagre first sketch we have now a highly coloured and detailed account, full of such plentiful eulogies of the Pope that one might almost call it a panegyric. At the very beginning the Florentine origin of the family is brought out, and at this point there is inserted, in accordance with the "hint" which had been communicated to him as above, the little story of the wonderful light which had surrounded the cradle of Pius IV. In other places too the "hints" are used almost word for word, while at the same time many other changes are made, which obviously may also be attributed to similar "hints" from the intimate friends of the Pope. The account of the successive steps in the rise of Pius IV. is much more exact than in the first edition. In support of his own credibility Panvinio says twice over that he is writing as an eye-witness (p. 316b and 317). Here too the contrast between Medici and Paul IV., passed over in the first edition, is suitably emphasized, together with the former's absence from Rome. In the second edition the good qualities of Pius IV., and especially his liberality, are much more fully exemplified; when speaking of the Pope's nephews, Charles Borromeo is especially extolled and praised, having been altogether forgotten in the first edition. The merits of Pius IV. in connection with the success of the Council are brought out in high relief, and painted in bright colours, not without a hint at the contrast to the conduct of the preceding Popes. When he speaks of the decision of the question about the *continuatio* or *nova*

---

[1] The date is surprising, because the account goes to the end of 1562; the right to print from Cosimo de' Medici is dated: Ap. 1, 1562, and that from Venice Aug. 21, 1561. Can Panvinio have chosen this earlier date in order to make people forget the first edition?

indictio of the Council, the expedient adopted by the Pope is praised in the highest terms. But on the other hand the hard treatment shown in the suit against the Carafa, is made to appear in as favourable a light as possible for Pius IV., altogether in accordance with the wishes of the court. How very accommodating Panvinio showed himself to be in this matter comes out clearly by comparing the two editions (see *infra* p. 424 *seqq*). Certainly Šusta is not making too severe a judgment when he says (p. 163) that the second edition has all the excellencies as well as all the defects of an official historian.

Panvinio has built up his new edition of the Vita Pii IV. merely on the basis of a biography of that pontiff, which he inserted in his larger work *De varia Romani pontificis creatione libri X*. This work, which was added to in many respects, remained unpublished: Merkle was the first to publish it (II. 586–600) from the Munich codex. The codex in the Papal Secret Archives (Miscell. Arm. XI., 122) which was used by Šusta, escaped the notice of Merkle. It would be desirable, if circumstances should permit me to return to work in Rome, to compare this codex with that at Munich, and also with Cod. Vat. lat. 6775.

If in his second edition Panvinio yielded very much to external influences, he did so no less in the third, which he printed and published under Pius V. By that time in official circles in Rome an altogether different view of Pius IV., in some ways rather unfavourable, had become current. It is with pain and surprise that one sees how Panvinio now made no scruple about reckoning to a great extent with this new tendency. The dedication of Panvinio to Pius V. bears the date November 1, 1567, and therefore came immediately after the rehabilitation of the Carafa. If before he had magnified the crime, Panvinio now adds apologetic observations. With regard to the influence to which he was yielding in so doing, Šusta refers to a letter, which he has discovered, from Panvinio to Cardinal Antonio Carafa, who had much at heart the rehabilitation of his uncle who had been put to death. Šusta (p. 163 *seqq.*) severely criticises the conduct of Panvinio, and calls attention to the spiteful additions, by means of which the biography of Pius IV., while retaining its original form, was now given an altogether different character. In so doing Panvinio worked with a skill that was worthy of a better cause. For example, the genealogical tree of Pius IV., which had been shown to take its roots in the soil of Florence, is not suppressed, but is depreciated by the remark that other families as well boasted of a similar origin and parentage. When he speaks of the father of the Pope, he makes the depreciatory remark that he rose to fame by farming the taxes. The story of the wonderful light that shone round the cradle of Pius IV. is omitted. Moreover, certain rather severe remarks about Paul IV., who had been very much esteemed by Pius V., are excised. In the same way the account of the relations between Cardinal Medici and Paul IV. are remodelled. Nor is the most important change effected by Panvinio his substantial transformation of his treatment of the trial and fall of the Carafa in the third edition, which is no longer, as it was in the second, favourable to Pius IV., but has now in conformity to the current popular view, become much more unfavourable to him; much more radical, however, are the changes which he makes in his description of the character of Pius IV., whose goodness of heart Panvinio had brought out very strongly in the second edition. None of this it is true, is retracted, but by means of spiteful additions, Pius IV. is made to appear in quite a different light. For example, before his election he was looked upon as a good-natured man, but afterwards he proved himself to be very different, and from being a man of honest and open character, he suddenly became deceitful and spiteful. Hitherto in this mixture of praise and blame, people saw an argument for the impartiality of Panvinio, and a judicious distribution of light and shade, but since Šusta discovered the genesis of these various biographical efforts of Panvinio such a view has become quite untenable. An author who, in the course of six years, on account of his susceptibility to external influences, changes so completely, and three separate times, his characterization of the same person cannot be considered as a reliable witness as to Pius IV. If for so long a time the last description of Pius IV. given by Panvinio passed for an impartial estimate, its origin shows it to have been an unbalanced combination of an officially inspired panegyric with a depreciation of the person in question, which only came into being when public opinion in Rome had changed.

No substantial change in this view is called for by a letter from Panvinio to Cardinal Charles Borromeo, dated August 16, 1567, and preserved in Cod. F. 39 Inf. of the Ambrosian Library, Milan. Tacchi Venturi (I., xi) has given a short summary of this. The whole content is as follows: I am about to write some biographies of the Popes from Sixtus IV. to Pius IV. "per aggiongerle al Platina" which has recently been printed. I have been asked in many quarters to republish Platina, and so I must add the life of Pius IV., and I do not like to issue the book before you have examined it. "Io sono obligato alla memoria di Pio IV. et però son proceduto nel bene che lui fece con molte et effetuose parole; nel male (perchè anche lui fu huomo) con tutto quel rispetto et brevità che ho saputo senza pregiudicar però alla verità et questo l'ho fatto accio che mi sia creduto il vero et non entri in opinione di bugiardo et adulatore, dalli quali errori me ne guardo quanto posso. V.S. piacendosi vedrà questa debol faticha et la racconcierà, muterà, aggiongerà, levarà quello che gli parrà sia honesto et conveniente che tanto mi sforzarò di lassar lei comandarà." I beg for a speedy reply, as I must send the book to Cologne, where it is being printed. It is already completed down to Clement VII.

So far it is not known what Borromeo replied, but the letter is highly significative of Panvinio's methods. It is painful to meet with such devices in a scholar,[1] who otherwise is so meritorious. Panvinio was a man of talent, but not of character. The setting forth of contemporary history is a dangerous reef for any historian, and Panvinio has run upon it.[2]

---

[1] It is only recently that the learned investigations of O. HARTIG have brought to light a merit of Panvinio's, hitherto unknown; his attempt at an iconography of the Popes, in which the liturgical vestments have been taken into consideration with much greater exactitude than in all the later collections of portraits of the Popes (see Histor. Jahrbuch, XXXVIII., 284-314, and Die Gründung der Münchever Hofbibliothek durch Albrecht V. und Johann Jakob Fugger, Munich, 1919, 218, 274, 410).

[2] So far so little is known of the character of Panvinio that, especially in this connection, the monograph prepared by SCHRORS, based upon his deep studies, seems very much wanted.

PANVINIO ON THE FALL OF THE CARAFA.

First Edition.

Carafarum eiusdem Pauli propinquorum res tam in patrui Pontificatu, quam aliis temporibus patratas, et praesertim bello Neapolitano, quo universus terrarum orbis, arque Urbs inprimis vexata fuerat, cardinalium aliquot, et Urbis gubernatoris Hieronymi episcopi Sagonensis sententiae subiecit. Unde cum eorum nomina inter reos recepta essent, Carolus et Alfonsus Carafae, Scipio Rebiba cardinales, Ioanes comes Montorii, qui dux Palliani dicebatur, Leonardus Cardineus, et Comes Allifanus, cum aliquot aliis Carafae domus clientibus, partim in Hadriani mole, partim in publicum carcerem diverso tempore coniecti, quaestionibus diligenter habitis singulorumque causis examinatis ex Pontificis auctoritate damnati sunt. Ex his Carolus cardinalis Carafa, nono carceris mense carneficis manu in mole Hadriani strangulatus est. Ioannes Montorii comes cum Allifano et Cardineo securi in publico carcere percussi, horrendum et maxime memorabile spectaculum, insolensque instabilis fortunae sursum deorsum omnia agitantis ludibrium, in publico expositi

Second Edition.

Carafarum Pauli IV. propinquorum crimina, cum patruo pontifice, bello potissimum Neapolitano, quo universa paene Italia atque Urbs inprimis et propinquae provinciae vexatae fuerunt, tum aliis temporibus in publicam incurrentia offensionem patrata cognoscere, et legitimis poenis vindicare statuit. Itaque quamquam suapte natura mitis et ab omni immanitate alienus, non potuit tamen et sui honoris et pontificii muneris causa ab huiusmodi capitali supplicio temperare.

VII Iduum Iuniarum igitur anni DLX Carolum et Alfonsum cardinales ad consistorium profectos, Ioannem vero Caroli fratrem, et Montorii comitem, Paliani ducem tum vocatum, qui paulo ante ex Gallesio Faliscorum in Urbem venerat, uxorisque eius fratrem comitem Allifanum Leonardumque Cardinem fratrum propinquum nihil tale suspicantes in Hadriani molem, et per eosdem dies aliquot alios Carafae domus clientes in publicum carcerem coniici mandavit.

Third Edition.

Pontifex interim, vel eorum memor quae in sui contumeliam cardinalis Carafa in conclavi dixerat, vel ducis Paliani regiae pro Ducatu Paliani compensationi (ut fama fuit) pro sororis filio inhians, aut (quod ipse aiebat) ut Romanorum pontificum propinquis salutare exemplum relinqueret, ut populos sibi creditos clementer acciperent et publica negocia pro ecclesiae dignitate conficerent, specie vindicandi ea crimina quae Carafae patruo Pontifice, et bello potissimum Neapolitano patraverant, questionem capitalem in eos instituere est aggressus.

Ita ut ad VII Idus Iunii MDLX quo die quinto ante anno Carafa purpurei pilei honore donatus fuerat, Carolum ipsum et Alfonsum cardinales ad consistorium profectos, Ioannem vero Caroli fratrem et Montorii comitem Paliani ducem tum vocatum, qui paulo ante ex Gallesio Faliscorum oppido in Urbem cum ipsius Pontificis licentia venerat, uxorisque eius fratrem comitem Allifanum, Leonardumque Cardinem fratrum propinquum nihil tale suspicantes, in Hadriani molem, et per eosdem dies aliquot alios Carafiae domus attonito et quorsum isthaec tenderent admiranti populo Romano, praebuerunt, quun omnes passim confluerent ad eos spectandos, qui modo miserabiliter extincti paulo ante urbem Romamet Italiam omnem solo nomine perterruerant. Alfonsus vero centum millibus aureorum persolutis et Camerae Apostolicae praefectura deposita, reliqui vadibus datis praeter unum Cardinalem Rebibam dimissi sunt.

Utque hoc iudicium sine ulla suspicione perageret, cardinalium quaestioni, octo eiusdem ordinis patres, comitis vero Montorii et aliorum Hieronymum episcopum Sagonensem Urbis gubernatorem, et Alexandrum Palanterium Fisci advocatum praefecit.

Quaestionibus diligenter per novem menses habitis, singulorumque criminibus accurate examinatis, postremo quum tota causa ad pontificum pleno in consistorio relata esset, Carolus cardinalis maiestatis, ab ipso pontifice, Comites Montorii et Allifanus, et Leonardus Cardines ab Urbis

clientes in publicum carcerem coniici mandavit.

Omnium quaestionibus relatores praefecit Urbis gubernatorem Hieronymum Fridericum, episcopum Sagonensem ministrum impigrum, audacem et acris virum ingenii, Alexandrum Palanterium procuratorem Fisci. Ut autem hoc iudicium rite peragere videretur, cardinalium quaestioni octo eiusdem ordinis patres integritate et iustitia insignes Fridericum Caesium episcopum, Bartholomaeum Cuevam, Ioannem Michaelem Saracenum, Ioannem Baptistam Cicadam, Michaelem Alexandrinum, Ioannem Bertrandum presbyteros, Iulium Ruvereum, et Luisium Cornelium diaconos cardinales adesse iussit, omnium inspectores Gubernatori et Fiscali assistentes. Quibus coram interrogati rei, cardinalis Carafae scriptae literae productae, et quaestionum principia agitata. Novissima vero causae cognitio iis non admissis, quum per novem menses instituta, singulorumque objecta examinata fuissent, Pontifex seorsum quaestiones videre voluit. Postremo, ut totius iudicii series ab omnibus patribus cognosci posset, tota causa ad Pontificem pleno in consistorio ab eodem qui quaesierat Gubernatore diei spatio it-gubernatore homicidii, et aliorum quorundam crimanum damnati sunt iudicique rerum capitalium mandatum, ut iuxta legitimas sanctiones lege in eos ageret.

Sic cardinalis strangulatus, comites et Cardines capitali supplicio affecti, maxime memorabile spectaculum, insolensque instabilis fortunae sursum deorsum omnia agitantis ludibrium populo Romano praebuerunt, iis vero qui secundiori aura altius provecti extra omnem sortem sese collocatos existimant documentum memorabile, ne summa potestate in summam licentiam conversa, illicita quaeque committere, perpetrareque sese posse impune confidant.

erata est, non auditae tamen patrum super ea re sententiae fuere. Tunc Carolus cardinalis maiestatis ab ipso Pontifice damnatus, et omnibus honorum gradibus exutus, curiae (ut vocant) saeculari castigandus traditus est: qui cum Comitibus Montorii, et Allifano, Leonardoque Cardino ab Urbis Gubernatore maiestatis, et homicidii damnatis, morti est addictus iudicique rerum capitalium mandatum, ut iuxta civiles sanctiones, lege in eos ageret. Sic sententiis in Cardinalem a Pontifice, in Ducem vero a Gubernatore Urbis subscriptis, Carolus in Hadriani mole carnificis manu nocte quae Nonas Martias praecessit, strangulatus, comites et Cardines in Turris Novae (sic !) carcere capitali supplicio affecti, maxime memorabile spectaculum, insolensque instabilis fortunae ludibrium, in publico ad pontem Aelium expositi, et paulo post ad damnatorum sepulchra relati, populo Romano attonito, et quorsum isthaec tenderent admiranti, praebuerunt; iis vero qui secundiori aura altius provecti, extra omnem sortem sese collocatos existimant, documentum memorabile, quum omnes passim confluerent ad eos spectandos, qui miserabiliter ab eo pontifice quem

Inter multas praecipau damnati cardinalis causa fuit, quod senem pontificem Paulum quamquam in bellum pronum, tamen non solum bellicarum re-

ipsi potissimum ad tantae potestatis culmen evexerant, extincti, nutu renutuque suo cuncta moderabantur. Ducis praesertim casum animo reputantes, quem paulo ante insigni militum et equitum manu stipatum, ac per Urbem more paene regio incedentem conspexerant, tunc vero eius corpus capite truncum miserabili aspectu publice collocatum viderent. Illud memoratu dignum, utrosque fratres non solum religiose et pie, quemadmodum optimos christianos decet cum poenitentiae sacramento excessisse, sed fortissimo animo tantam calamitatem, perinde ac a Deo iussam excepisse Ducis admirabilis constantia fuit, qui paulo ante obitum et socios metu caedis consternatos egregia oratione ad mortis contemptum adhortatus est, et litteras pulcherimas filio iuveni scripsit optimis monitis refertas, quibus ei christiano more bene precabatur. Cardinalis cadaver in propinqua divae Mariae Transpontinae aede publico sepulchro datum, mox ab eius familiaribus ad Minervae translatum, et in familiae eius sacello conditum est. Inter multas multas praecipue damnati cardinalis causae in quaestionum codicillis relatae sunt, quod senem pontificem Paulum, quamquam in rum sed omnis civilis gubernatoris imperitum falsis nuntiis et consiliis decepisset, multosque et maximae dignationis viros eius belli occasione vexare, persequi et etiam occidi iussisset, varias litteras et notas arbitrarias ementitus, et ut paucis omnia complectar, quod eius unius praecipue opera totum id bellum quod Paulus gessit susceptum, diutiusque maximo non privatorum solum, sed totius fere christiani orbis damno et apostolicae sedis dedecore productum fuisset.

Comitis vero et aliorum praeter supradictas causas (cum cardinali enim conspirasse videbantur) innocentis uxoris gravidae et suspecti adulteri ob suspicionem solam indigna caedes. Audivi ego a pontifice se aegerrimo animo id omnino fecisse et nihil sibi tota vita lugùbrius quam huiusmodi iudicium accidiss modi iudicium accidisse libentissimeque ad mitiorem poenam facile se fuisse inclinaturam, si id vel salvis aequioribus legibus facere, vel aliquam de illorum mutatione moribus fiduciam fiduciam habere potuisset. Necessarium enim his qui postea Romanorum pontificum propinqui futuri erant, esse affirmabat, qua ratione se in summa potestate locati gesturi sint, exemp-

bellum pronum, tamen bellicarum rerum imperitum, falsis nuntiis et consiliis decepisset, multos et maxime dignationis viros eius belli occasione vexare iussiset: quodque varias litteras et notas arbitrarias ementitus eius unius praecipue opera quinquenalibus inter reges Hispaniae et Galliae ictis induciis fractis, totum id bellum quod Paulus gessit susceptum diutiusque non sine magno Sedis Apostolicae detrimento productum fuisset.

Comiti propter crimen laesae maiestatis, et sociis, uxoris gravidae et adulteri indicta causa caedes obiectae.

Fuerunt plerique eo tempore iureconsulti, qui constantissime asseverarunt, iudicium id iniquum fuisse, quum Cardinalis sine testibus ex suis tantum litteris eorum redargutus damnatusque fuisset, quae Pauli IV iussu ab se facta esse contendebat, iis quae sibi obiecta fuerant more Romano quaestioni et tormento subiecto non expressis, dilationibus quas petebat non concessis, patronis vero eius raro auditis. Pontifex vero videri voluit eos non eo consilio vinxisse ut morti traderet, at in quaestionibus habendis exacerbatus magnitudinem demun rei intellexisse, quum ei persuasum esset, Cardinalem animi excelsi et intrepidi si dimitlum praebere : et anteactam illorum vitam sanguinariam et malo assuetam spem omnem in meliorem vitam praecidisse et omne mitigandae poenae temperamentum abstulisse, denique nullum apud Pium pontificem mansuetudini aut clementiae locum reliquisse, quod ex eo certius licuit coniicere quum longe mitius actum sit cum Alfonso, qui mansuetae continentis naturae haud dubium specimen debat ; ipse namque pecunia tantum et Camerae Apostolicae praefectura multatus, cum reliquis omnibus libere dimissus est.

teretur in suorum quempiam aliquando impetum facturum. Quo timore eum semel gravissime laesum tolli iussit, in reliquos clementius, quos minus peccasse profitebatur haud dubie acturas, ni fortuna iis adversa pontificis inflammatum animum mipulisset, ut eos potius perdendos, quam Cardinalem conservandum eixstimasset.

Aliquanto mitius cum Alfonso cardinali, qui mansuetae continentisque naturae haud dubium specimen dabat, actum : ipse namque, qui die obitus Pontificis quaedam e cubiculo eius subripuisse accusatus fuerat, centum milibus aureorum Vitellii cardinalis studio comparatis, persolutis, Camerae Apostolicae praefectura multatus, cum reliquis omnibus libere, ea conditione tamen dimissus est, ne Urbe egrederetur.

INDEX OF NAMES IN VOL. XV.

AELST, Nic. v. (engraver), 84 n. 1.
Agostino, Antonio (Bishop of Alife, later of Lerida), 304, 336, 358.
Alba, the Duke of, 25 n. 1, 26 n. 6, 204.
Albert Alcibiades (Margrave of Brandenburg), 150 *seq.*, 153, 186.
Albert V. (Duke of Bavaria), 102, 164 n. 3, 189, 237, 239, 277, 289, 313 n.
Alife, Ferrante, Count of (brother-in-law of Giov. Carafa, Duke of Paliano), 137 *seq.*, 144, 153, 159, 166 *seq.*, 171 *seq.*
Alife, Violante d' (wife of Giov. Carafa, Duke of Paliano), 136–138, 147, 153 *seq.*, 159 *seq.*, 175.
Altemps, *see* Hohenems.
Amulio, *see* Mula.
Antoniano, Silvio (latinist, papal secretary), 78 n. 2.
Araceli, Cardinal of, *see* Dolera.
Aragona, Giovanna d', 105 n. 3, 143.
Arco, Count (High Chamberlain to Ferdinand I.), 183, 248, 320.
Arco, Prospero (Imperial envoy in Rome), 117 n. 2, 192 *seq.*, 200, 256, 289 n. 1, 353.
Arco, Scipione ("obedienza" envoy of Ferdinand I.), 125, 180, 189.
Arezzo, Francisco d' (confessor of Card. Carlo Carafa), 170 n.
Armagnac, Cardinal, 6, 7 n. 1, 9, 13, 21, 24 n. 2.
Arona, Count of, *see* Borromeo, Giberto.
Arrivabene, Giov. Francesco (familiar of Card. Ercole Gonzaga), 278, 292.
Aubespine, Sebast. de l' (Bishop of Limoges, French envoy to Spain), 204.
Augustus (Elector of Saxony), 226.
Avalos, Iñigo, de Aragon, Cardinal, 163.
Avila, Luis de (Spanish envoy in Rome), 328 *seqq.*
Ayala, Juan de (Spanish envoy in Rome), 249, 252.

BAGNO, Giov. Francesco, Count, 5, 57.
Baius, Michael (theologian), 233.
Bascapè (General of the Barnabites, Bishop of Novara), 96 n. 3, 109 n. 1, 112 n. 4.
Bellay, Eustache du (Bishop of Paris), 332, 337.
Bellay, Jean du, Cardinal, 5, 6 n. 4, 7, 9, 13, 20 *seqq.*, 31, 45 *seqq.*, 50 *seqq.*, 173.
Berghen, Robert van (Bishop of Liège), 233.
Bertrand, Cardinal, 7 n. 3, 14, 147, 173 n. 2.
Blarer, Gerwig (Abbot of Weingarten), 239.
Bochetel (Bishop of Rennes, French envoy in Vienna), 217.

Boncompagni, Ugo (Legate for Spain, Cardinal, afterwards Pope Gregory XIII.), 305.
Bondonus, Ludovicus, de Branchis Firmanus (master of ceremonies at the conclave of Pius IV.), 1 n. 1, 17 n. 3, 31, 44 n. 4, 62 n. 1, 158 n. 2.
Bonhomini, G. Fr. (auditor of Card. C. Borromeo), 111 n. 1.
Borghese, Marcantonio (advocate for Card. C. Carafa), 148 n., 155.
Borromeo, Family of the, 80 n. 2, 98, 102, 104.
Borromeo, Anna (sister to Card. C. Borromeo, wife of Fabrizio Colonna), 113 n. 2.
Borromeo, Camilla (sister to Card. C. Borromeo, wife of Cesare Gonzaga, Count of Guastalla), 113 n. 2.
Borromeo, Charles, Cardinal (nephew of Pius IV.), xli., 95–99, 101 *seq.*, 105–113, 115–122, 129, 142 *seq.*, 185, 200, 205, 208, 210, 212, 229, 232, 236, 247, 251 *seq.*, 256, 261 *seq.*, 268, 270, 275 *seq.*, 279, 281, 291 n. 1, 292 *seqq.*, 299, 304 *seqq.*, 313 n. 2, 314, 316, 325, 341, 351, 353, 361, 377 *seq.*
Borromeo, Federigo (nephew of Pius IV., captain-general of the church), 95 *seq.*, 98 *seqq.*, 108, 114 *seq.*
Borromeo, Federigo, Cardinal, 105 n. 3, 312 n. 5.
Borromeo, Francesco, Count (uncle to Card. C. Borromeo), 109.
Borromeo, Geronima (sister to Card. C. Borromeo, wife of Fabrizio Gesualdo, Prince of Venosa), 113 n. 2.
Borromeo, Giberto, Count of Arona (husband of Margherita de' Medici, sister of Pius IV.), 94, 95, 107, 113 n. 2.
Borromeo, Guido, Count (uncle to Card. C. Borromeo), 109.
Borromeo, Ortensia (daughter of Giberto Borromeo, wife of Count Hannibal von Hohenems), 113 n. 2.
Bourbon, Antoine de, *see* Vendôme.
Bourbon, Charles de, Cardinal (of Vendôme), 7.
Bourdaisière, Jean Babou de la (French "obedienza" envoy in Rome, brother to the Cardinal), 183, 200.
Bourdaisière, Philibert Babou de la, Cardinal (Bishop of Angoulême, French ambassador in Rome), 163, 217, 280, 316.
Brancaccio, Cesare (familiar of Card. C. Carafa), 144.
Branda, Cardinal, 68.
Braun, Conrad (theologian), 319.
Brendel, Daniel (Archbishop and Elector of Mayence), 236.
Brus von Müglitz, Anton (Archbishop of Prague, envoy of Ferdinand I. at the Council of Trent), 237, 266, 288, 344.

Caligari, G. A., 256 n. 2.
Campegio, Francesco (Bishop of Feltre), 338.
Campegio, Giovanni (Bishop of Bologna, nuncio), 253.
Canisius, Peter, St. (S.J.), xlvii., 285 n. 1, 319, 325.
Canobio, Giov. Franc. (papal chamberlain, envoy), 241, 249 *seqq.*, 254.
Capece, Marcello (steward to the Duke Giov. Carafa), 137, 147, 153, 156.
Capilupi, Camillo (familiar of Card. C. Borromeo), 13 n. 3, 120 n. 1.
Capizuchi, Cardinal, 6, 7 n. 1, 14.
Capodiferro, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 7, 14, 24 n. 2., 42, 50.

Capua, Pietro Ant. di (Archbishop of Otranto), 297.
Caracciolo, Ascanio (secretary to Vargas), 35, 134 n. 1.
Caracciolo, Niccolò Maria (Archbishop of Catania), 364.
Carafa, Family of the, 4 *seq.*, 14, 62, 130, 131 *seqq.*, 175, 395.
Carafa, Alfonso (nephew of Paul IV.), Cardinal, 3, 14 *seq.*, 19, 24 n. 2, 50, 54, 56 *seqq.*, 60, 131, 139, 144–149, 153, 166, 173, 175.
Carafa, Antonio (Marquis of Montebello), 5, 15 n. 2, 57 *seqq.*, 144, 175.
Carafa, Carlo Cardinal (nephew of Paul IV.), 4 *seq.*, 6 n. 4, 8, 14 *seq.*, 19 *seqq.*, 27, 33 *seqq.*, 42, 46 *seqq.*, 50, 54 *seq.*, 57 *seqq.*, 61 *seqq.*, 81, 131–172, 175, 390.
Carafa, Diomede, Cardinal, 14, 24 n. 2, 54, 168.
Carafa, Giovanni (Duke of Paliano), 3 *seq.*, 14 *seq.*, 131, 136 *seqq.*, 141–145, 147 *seqq.*, 153–162, 167 *seqq.*, 175, 390.
Carafa of Polignano (Marchesa, sister to Giovanni Carafa), 169 n. 1.
Cardine, Lionardo di (uncle to Violante d' Alife), 137 *seq.*, 144, 153, 159, 166, 171 *seq.*
Carpi, Pio Ridolfo, Cardinal, 5, 9, 11, 14, 16, 18 *seqq.*, 24 n. 2, 28, 38 *seq.*, 41 *seq.*, 48, 50, 54, 60, 128, 132, 145, 156, 166, 207, 212.
Castagna, Giov. Batt. (Archbishop of Rossano, nuncio to Spain, afterwards Pope Urban VII.), 295, 335.
Catherine de' Medici, *see* Medici.
Cauco, Ant. (Archbishop of Corfù), 267.
Cesarini, Family of the, 176.
Cesi, Cardinal, 14, 24 n. 2, 46 54 *seqq.*, 58, 117, 147, 207.
Charles II. (Duke of Lorraine), 236.
Charles III. (Duke of Savoy), 71 *seqq.*
Charles V., The Emperor, 25, 42, 69 *seq.*, 72 *seq.*, 76, 145, 165.
Charles IX. (King of France), 217, 254, 347, 349.
Châtillon, Odet de', Cardinal (Bishop of Beauvais), 7.
Chiurelia, Antonio (Bishop of Budua), 273.
Cicada, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 14, 24 n. 2, 128, 147, 174, 211, 280 *seq.*
Cithard (confessor to Ferdinand I.), 286 n. 1.
Clement VII., Pope, 25, 70, 72, 244.
Cock, H. (engraver), 84 n. 1.
Colonna, Family of the, 60, 159, 176.
Colonna, Fabrizio (husband of Anna Borromeo), 113 n. 2.
Colonna, Marcantonio, 3, 35, 113 n. 2, 135, 140 *seq.*, 176.
Colonna, Pompeo (commander of Papal troops), 62.
Commendone, Giov. Francesco, Cardinal (Bishop of Zante, nuncio), 207 n. 1., 218–238, 242 n. 2., 269 *seq.*, 309 *seq.*, 340, 360.
Concini, Bartolomeo (Florentine envoy in Rome), 12, 59.
Concini, Matteo (Florentine envoy in Rome), 12, 53 n., 4.
Consiglieri, Cardinal 7.
Consuberi, Tommaso (Bishop of Città di Penna), 144.
Contarini, Cardinal, 320.
Conti, Torquato (general), 129 n. 3.
Cordella, Fabio (master of the Conclave), 44.
Cordova, Francisco de (Spanish Franciscan, confessor to the wife of Maximilian II.), 206 n. 1, 286 n. 1, 319.
Corgna, Cardinal, 14, 24 n. 2, 51, 52 n.

Corgna, Ascanio della (nephew of Julius III.), 2, 4, 6 n. 4.
Cornaro (Bishop of Treviso), 355.
Cornaro, Cardinal, 14, 17, 51, 147.
Cornaro, Marco (Archbishop of Spalato), 290
Correggio, Girolamo da, Cardinal, 163.
Cosimo I. (Duke of Florence), 12 *seq.*, 18, 26, 29, 36, 42, 57 *seqq.*, 74, 77, 80 *seq.*, 91, 93 *seq.*, 98, 100, 114, 134, 149 n. 4, 156, 163, 172, 174, 211 n. 1, 393.
Couvillon, J. (S.J.), Bavarian envoy to the Council of Trent, 277 n. 4.
Crispi, Tiberio, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 14, 21, 24 n. 2, 166.
Cristoforo of Padua (General of the Augustinians), 285.
Crivelli, Alessandro, Cardinal (Bishop of Cariati, nuncio), 294.
Cuesta (Bishop of León), 358.
Cueva, Bartolomeo de la, Cardinal, 6 n. 5, 14, 17, 24 n. 2, 31 n. 1, 32, 43, 86, 128, 147, 151 *seq.*

Dandino, Cardinal, 7, 12, 14, 24 n. 2, 41 n. 1, 42, 50, 219.
Dandolo, Matteo (Venetian envoy to the Council of Trent), 271 n. 7.
Danes (Bishop of Lavaur), 304.
Delfino, Zaccaria, Cardinal (Bishop of Lesina, nuncio), 112 n. 4, 194, 196 *seqq.*, 200, 205, 207 *seqq.*, 218, 220–225, 238 *seqq.*, 254, 257, 260, 262, 270, 283, 288, 313 n. 2, 314, 320, 323, 346 n. 1, 352.
Dolera (Araceli), Cardinal, 11, 14, 24 n. 2, 40, 128, 132.
Draskovich, G. (Bishop of Fünfkirchen, envoy of Ferdinand I. to the Council of Trent), 257, 265 *seqq.*, 289, 295, 299, 329.
Dudith, Andr. Sbardelatus (Bishop of Knin, Hungarian procurator at the Council of Trent), 271, 290, 295.

Eichorn, Joh. (Abbot of Einsiedeln, Swiss procurator at the Council of Trent), 271.
Elio, Antonio (Patriarch of Jerusalem), 267.
Elizabeth (Queen of England), 182, 235 *seq.*
Ems, *see* Hohenems.
Eric II. (Duke of Brunswick), 228.
Eric XIV. (King of Sweden), 234 *seqq.*
Este, Ippolito d', Cardinal of Ferrara (Legate to France), 6 n. 4, 7 *seqq.*, 12 *seq.*, 16, 19, 21, 23, 26, 36, 39 *seqq.*, 47, 49 n., 60 *seqq.*, 129, 145, 166, 213.
Este, Luigi d', Cardinal, 163.

Facchinetti, Giov. Ant. (canonist, nuncio to Venice), 305.
Farnese, Family of the, 177.
Farnese, Alessandro, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 14 *seq.*, 19, 23 *seq.*, 27, 34, 38, 40, 45, 48, 50 *seq.*, 54 *seqq.*, 60, 76 *seq.*, 128, 145, 166, 212, 348, 354.
Farnese, Ottavio (Duke), 76.
Farnese, Pier Luigi, 74, 77.
Farnese, Ranuccio, Cardinal, 7 n. 1, 14, 22, 24 n. 1, 32, 354.
Federici, Girolamo (Bishop of Sagona, governor of Rome), 138, 147, 157 *seq.*, 161, 166, 171, 176.
Ferdinand I., The Emperor, 11 n. 6, 29, 73 *seq.*, 83 n. 1 100, 103, 124 *seq.*, 179 *seqq.*, 185–198, 200 *seqq.*, 207 *seqq.*, 213 *seqq.*, 216–224, 241 *seq.*, 246–251, 257, 265 *seq.*, 268–271, 276, 283, 286 *seqq.*, 300, 308–326, 329, 339, 342–347, 352, 357.

Ferdinand, Archduke of Austria (governor of Bohemia), 222.
Ferdinand of Bavaria (son of Duke Albert V.), 313 n.
Ferreri, Pier Francesco (Bishop of Vercelli, nuncio to Venice, Cardinal), 163.
Ferrier, Armand du (President of the Paris Parliament, French envoy to the Council of Trent), 282, 306, 348 *seqq.*
Figini (painter), 105 n. 3.
Figueroa, Juan de (Spanish envoy in Rome), 10 *seq.*, 28 n. 8.
Filonardo, Paolo (secretary to Card. Alfonso Carafa), 144.
Firmanus, *see* Bondonus.
Fornero, Ambrogio (chamberlain to Card. C. Borromeo), 120.
Foscarari, Egidio (O.P., Bishop of Modena), 119 n. 2, 335.
Fosso, Gasparre del (Archbishop of Reggio), 265.
Francis I. (King of France), 67.
Francis II. (King of France), 9, 183, 188, 194 *seq.*, 198 *seq.*, 203, 209, 217.
Francis de Sales, St., 378.
Frederick II. (King of Denmark), 232 *seqq.*
Gaddi, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 14, 24 n. 1, 49 n.
Gaetano di Tiene, xli.
Gallarate, Girolamo (Bishop of Sutri - Nepi, nephew of Card. Morone), 301 n. 2.
Galli, Tolomeo (secretary of the Papal chancery, Cardinal), 110, 260 n. 1.
Gambara, Francesco, Cardinal (Bishop of Brescia), 163.
Geraldi, Giovanni (Papal envoy to Russia), 251.
Gesualdo, Alfonso, Cardinal, 163
Gesualdo, Fabrizio (Prince of Venosa, husband of Geronima Borromeo), 113 n. 2.
Gherio (Bishop of Ischia, Papal envoy to Spain), 203 *seq.*, 326 n. 3,
Ghislieri, Michele (O.P.), Cardinal, 14, 24 n. 1; 32, 50, 150.
Gianfigliazzi, Bongianni (Florentine envoy in Rome), 12, 24 n. 2.
Gienger, Georg (imperial councillor), 189, 286 n. 1, 319 n. 3.
Giussano (biographer of Charles Borromeo), 97 n.
Givry, de, Cardinal, 7.
Gomez, Ruy, 25 n. 1.
Gonzaga, Cesare (Count of Guastalla, husband of Camilla Borromeo), 99, 113 n. 2.
Gonzaga, Curzio, 30, 47 n. 2, 48 n. 1.
Gonzaga, Ercole, Cardinal (of Mantua), 6 n. 4, 9, 12 n. 2, 14 *seq.*, 20, 22 *seqq.*, 26 *seqq.*, 33 *seqq.*, 40, 47 *seq.*, 50, 57, 64, 132, 135, 165, 243 *seq.*, 246 *seq.*, 252, 262, 264 *seq.*, 274, 280 *seq.*, 284, 291 *seqq.*, 302, 306 *seq.*, 310 *seq.*, 315, 335.
Gonzaga, Federigo, Cardinal, 162 n. 3.
Gonzaga, Ferrante, 78 n. 1, 99.
Gonzaga, Francesco, Cardinal (nephew of Cardinal Ercole), 163, 292.
Gonzaga, Giovan Maria, 146 n. 2.
Gonzaga, Vincenzo, 130.
Gonzaga, William (Duke of Mantua), 21 n. 1, 29, 37, 156, 264, 389.
Grandi, Giulio (ambassador of the Duke of Ferrara), 96, 97 n. 3, 152 n. 1.
Grandis, Julius de (Bishop of Anglona), 51 n. 4.
Granvelle, Cardinal, 163.
Grassi, Carlo (Bishop of Montefiascone), 349.
Graziani, Ant. Maria (secretary to Commendone), 219 n. 4, 226 n.
Grecco, Michele (painter), 6 n. 1.

Grimani, Giovanni (Patriarch of Aquileia), 162 n. 3.
Guadagno, Franc. di (Mantuan ambassador in Rome), 19 n., 24 n. 2, 389.
Gualterio, Sebastian (Bishop of Viterbo, nuncio to France), 59 n. 1, 184, 242, 256.
Guasto (Imperial viceroy of Milan), 72.
Guerrero, Pedro (Archbishop of Granada), 263, 265, 272, 282, 300, 329, 332 358, 360, 365.
Guido, Antonio (conclavist), 9.
Guise, Charles de (Archbishop of Rheims, Cardinal of Lorraine), 7, 10 n. 2, 21 *seqq.*, 47 *seqq.*, 52 *seq.*, 55, 60 *seq.*, 236, 302 *seqq.*, 305, 307, 309 *seq.*, 312, 315 *seqq.*, 326, 336, 339, 345, 347, 350 *seq.*, 353, 355, 358, 360, 363 *seqq.*
Guise, Francis de (Duke), 7, 329.
Guise, Louis de, Cardinal, 7 n. 1, 13.

Haller, Leonard (Bishop of Eichstätt), 296.
Helding, Michael (Bishop of Merseburg), 239.
Henry II. (King of France), 9.
Henry, Infant of Portugal, Cardinal, 7, 17.
Henry the younger (Duke of Brunswick), 228.
Herborth, Valentin (Bishop of Przemysl, Polish envoy to the Council of Trent), 303 n. 2.
Hohenems (Altemps), Family of, 80 n. 2, 94, 102 *seqq.*
Hohenems, Gabriel von (nephew of Pius IV.), 95, 104.
Hohenems, Hannibal von (nephew of Pius IV., captain-general of the Church), 81 n. 2, 103 n. 3, 104 n. 2, 113 n. 2, 117 n. 1, 120 n. 1, 141, 403.
Hohenems, Helena von (daughter of Wolf Dietrich), 95.
Hohenems [Ems], Jakob von (cousin to Mark Sittich I.), 95.
Hohenems, Jakob Hannibal von, 95, 104.
Hohenems, Margaret von (daughter of Wolf Dietrich), 95, 104.
Hohenems, Mark Sittich I. von, 70, 95.
Hohenems, Mark Sittich II., Cardinal [Altemps], nephew to Pius IV., 95, 102 n. 4, 103, 117 n. 1, 120 n. 1, 163, 257, 262, 265, 283.
Hohenems, Robert von (natural son of Card. Mark Sittich), 104 n. 1.
Hohenems, Wolf Dietrich von (husband of Chiara, the sister of Pius IV.), 94 *seq.*, 95.
Hosius, Stanislaus, Cardinal (Bishop of Ermland, nuncio in Vienna), 123 n. 1, 162, 182, 185, 188, 191 *seq.*, 205, 207 n. 1, 220, 234, 241 *seq.*, 244 *seqq.*, 248, 250, 254, 264, 273, 285, 311, 316, 360.
Hoya, Joh. von (Bishop of Osnabrück), 228, 231.
Hülsen, F. van (engraver), 84 n. 1.

Ignatius of Loyola, St., xli., 117.
Isachino, Geremia (Theatine), 152 n. 1.
Ivan Wassiljewiez (The Terrible, Tsar of Russia), 251.

Joachim II. (Elector of Brandenburg), 73, 226 *seq.*
John, Margrave of Brandenburg (brother to Joachim II.), 227.
John Frederick, Duke of Weimar, 226.
Julius III., Pope, 77 *seqq.*, 184, 213, 219, 245 *seq.*, 260, 263,

Justiniani, Vincent (General of the Dominicans), 285.

Kerssenbrock, Rembert von (Bishop of Paderborn), 228.
Kolosváry (Bishop of Csanád), 271.
Konarski, Adam (Prior of Posen, envoy of Polish King), 181.

Lafreri, Ant. (engraver), 84 n. 1.
Lainez, General of the Jesuits, 119 n. 1, 213, 296, 301, 305, 310, 332 *seqq.*, 348.
Lansac (French envoy to the Council of Trent), 275, 282, 306, 308.
Lenoncourt, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 14, 17, 24 n. 2.
Lenzi, Lorenzo (Bishop of Fermo, nuncio to France), 242.
Leoni, L. (artist), 84 n. 1.
Leva, de (Imperial commander), 69.
Leyen, Joh. von der (Archbishop of Trêves), 229 *seq.*
Lodi, Ercole (friend of Card. C. Borromeo), 109.
Loemans, A. (engraver), 84 n. 1.
Lorraine, Cardinal of, *see* Guise, Charles.
Lottino (Roman agent of Duke Cosimo I.), 12.
Luna, Count of (Spanish envoy to the Council of Trent), 309, 317, 331, 336, 338, 342 *seq.*, 353, 356 n. 1, 357, 361.
Lussy, Melchior (Orator of the Swiss Catholic Cantons at the Council of Trent), 271.

Madruzzo, Cristoforo, Cardinal (Bishop of Trent), 6 n. 4, 14, 22 *seqq.*, 28, 30, 33 *seq.*, 38, 40, 47, 55, 61, 103 *seq.*, 125, 128, 135, 183, 208, 252, 264, 266 *seq.*, 273, 277, 284, 290, 295, 297, 303, 307, 309, 336, 351, 355, 358, 361.
Madruzzo, Lodovico, Cardinal, 163.
Manelli, Antonio (treasurer of the Council of Trent), 247 n. 1.
Manne, Abbot of (French envoy in Rome), 188, 192, 195, 199.
Mansfeld, Joh. Gebhard von (Archbishop of Cologne), 229.
Marcellus II., Pope, 12 n. 4, 78 *seq.*
Margaret of Parma (Governess of the Netherlands), 41 n. 1.
Marini, Lionardo (Archbishop of Lanciano), 291, 293, 295, 331, 335.
Marinis, Angelo de (sculptor), 84 n. 1.
Mark Sittich von Hohenems, *see* Hohenems.
Martinengo, Girolamo (Abbot, nuncio for England), 235.
Martyribus, Bartholomew de (Archbishop of Braga), 118, 252, 354.
Mary Stuart (Queen of Scotland), 236.
Mascareynas, Fernando Martinez de (Portuguese envoy to the Council of Trent), 266.
Massarelli, Angelo (secretary to the Council), 180, 247, 262.
Massaria (Italian Protestant), 239.
Massimi, Family of the, 176.
Massimo, Domenico, 153.
Maximilian II. (King of the Romans), 124, 198, 300, 319 *seq.*, 325, 339, 351 *seq.*, 357.
Medici, Milanese family of the, 66 *seqq.*, 72, 94, 177.
Medici, Agostino de' (brother of Pius IV.), 80 n. 2, 94.
Medici, Bernardino de' (father of Pius IV.), 66 *seq.*
Medici, Catherine de' (Queen of France), 12, 18, 39, 217, 256, 282, 329.

Medici, Chiara de' (sister of Pius IV.), 70, 80 n. 2, 94 *seq.*

Medici, Cosimo de', *see* Cosimo I.

Medici, Ferdinando de', Cardinal (son of Cosimo I.), 312 n. 5.

Medici, Gian Angelo de', Cardinal (Pope Pius IV.), 6 n. 5, 11 *seq.*, 14, 16, 18 *seq.*, 23, 26, 28 *seq.*, 32 *seq.*, 53–62, 66 *seqq.*

Medici, Gian Battista de' (brother of Pius IV.), 72.

Medici, Gian Giacomo (di Musso), 67–74, 77, 79, 81 *seq.*, 94.

Medici, Giovanni de', Cardinal (son of Cosimo I.), 98, 212.

Medici, Margherita de' (sister of Pius IV., wife of Giberto Borromeo, Count of Arona), 94.

Melis, Gasparino de (head of the Roman police), 169, 171.

Mercurio, Cardinal (of Messina), 6 n. 4, 14, 24 n. 2, 51 *seqq.*

Mendoça, Pedro Gonzalez de (Bishop of Salamanca), 263 n. 2, 282, 284, 304 n. 2.

Mendoza, Francisco de, Cardinal, 7, 63 *seq.*

Metzler von Andelberg, Christopher (Bishop of Constance), 239.

Meudon, Cardinal, 7.

Michelangelo, 111 n. 2.

Minas (Negus of Abyssinia), 255 n.

Mocenigo, Luigi (Venetian ambassador in Rome), 26 n. 6, 31, 92.

Monte, Cristoforo del, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 14, 24 n. 2.

Monte, Innocenzo del, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 14, 24 n. 2, 142, 156 n. 3, 174.

Montmorency, the Constable, 329.

Moragna (painter), 159.

Moretto (court jester to Pius IV.), 88 n. 3.

Morone, Giov. Girolamo, Cardinal, 3, 7 *seq.*, 11, 14, 20, 30, 61, 75, 77, 98, 122, 125, 128, 155, 183, 197, 202, 243, 252 n. 2, 315–327, 328 *seq.*, 331, 334, 336 *seq.*, 341, 345 *seqq.*, 353 *seq.*, 358 *seqq.*, 361, 364 *seq.*

Morone, Girolamo (chancellor of Milan, father to the Cardinal), 67 *seq.*, 69.

Morvillier, Jean (Bishop of Orleans), 303.

Moya de Contreras, Asciscio (Bishop of Vich), 255.

Mula [Amulio], Marcantonio da Cardinal (Venetian ambassador in Rome), 86, 91 *seq.*, 93, 123 n. 1, 142, 145, 151, 160, 162, 184 *seq.*, 243 n. 5, 328, 390, 401, 404.

Musotti (secretary to the Cardinal of Lorraine), 335.

Navagero, Bernardo, Cardinal (Venetian ambassador, Bishop of Verona), 13 n. 2, 123 n. 1, 162, 280, 315 *seq.*, 317 n. 1, 348.

Neri, Philip, St., xli.

Niquet, Abbot of St. Gildas (secretary to Card. Este), 217, 242, 276.

Noailles, François de (Bishop of Dax, French envoy), 5.

Nobili, Vico de', 144, 159.

Noguera, Giacomo Giberto di (Bishop of Alife), 304, 337.

Oberg, Burkard von (Bishop of Hildesheim), 328.

Odescalchi, Paolo (auditor of Card. C. Borromeo, Papal envoy to Spain), 110 n.

Olario, Bernardino, 159.

Ormanetto, Niccolò, 331 n. 3.

Orsini, Lodovico (Count of Pitigliano), 74.

Osio (Bishop of Rieti), 295.

Pacheco, Francisco, Cardinal, 24 n. 2, 163.

Pacheco, Pedro, Cardinal, 14, 18, 21, 28 *seq.*, 32, 38, 40, 45, 50 *seqq.*, 131 *seq.*, 180.

Paleotto, Gabriele, Cardinal, 335.

Pallantieri, Alessandro (fiscal-procurator), 138 *seq.*, 147, 154, 157 *seq.*, 161, 166, 171, 176.

Panvinio, Onofrio (historian), 1 n. 1, 54 *seq.*, 61, 63, 176 *seq.*, 415.

Pasqua, Simone (physician), 151.

Paul II., Pope, 296.

Paul III., Pope, xliii., 73 *seq.*, 76, 213, 223, 245 *seq.*, 260, 263, 274, 281.

Paul IV., Pope, xli., 1 *seqq.*, 5–8, 14 *seq.*, 20, 23, 43, 58 n. 1, 62, 78 *seqq.*, 81 *seqq.*, 90, 123 *seq.*, 126 *seqq.*, 130, 131 *seqq.*, 145, 148, 153, 159, 161, 173, 175, 219.

Paumgartner, Augustine (Bavarian envoy to the Council of Trent), 277 n. 4, 289.

Pellegrini, Pellegrino (architect), 122.

Pellevé, Nicholas de (Bishop of Amiens, later of Sens, Papal envoy to Scotland), 303, 349.

Pendaso, Federigo (proxy in Rome for the legates of the Council, companion to Commendone), 277 *seqq.*

Perez, Lorenzo (Portuguese envoy in Rome), 276.

Peruschi (S.J., rector of the Roman Seminary), 167.

Pescara, Fernando Francisco de Avalos (envoy from Philip II. to Trent), 271, 276, 283, 317, 331.

Pflug, Julius (Bishop of Naumburg), 225.

Philip II. (King of Spain), 10 *seq.*, 12, 15, 17 *seq.*, 26, 28 *seqq.*, 34–41, 44 *seqq.*, 50 *seq.*, 56 *seq.*, 59, 63 *seq.*, 100, 104, 116, 132 *seqq.*, 141 *seq.*, 149, 152, 163 *seqq.*, 171, 175, 179 *seqq.*, 185 *seqq.*, 192, 195, 201 *seqq.*, 209, 218, 242, 249, 253 *seqq.*, 276, 283, 294, 309, 314, 328–332, 338 *seq.*, 341, 343, 357 *seq.*, 361.

Pia, Bernardino, 133.

Pibrac, Gui du Faur de (French envoy to the Council of Trent), 282, 348.

Piccolomini, Family of the, 176.

Pietro, Fra (Capuchin), 160.

Pisani, Francesco, Cardinal, 9, 14, 18, 46, 50.

Pius IV., Pope, *see* Medici, Gian Angelo and *Contents.*

Pius V., Pope, xli., xlv., 120.

Pistoja, xlvii.

Pogiano, Guilio (humanist), 6.

Polanco (S.J.), 119.

Pante, Niccolò da (Venetian envoy to Council of Trent), 271 n. 7.

Pseaume, Nicolas (Bishop of Verdun), 303, 332 n. 2.

Puteo, Giacomo, Cardinal, 11, 14, 18, 24 n. 2, 28, 78, 128, 147, 151 n. 2, 207, 211, 243 *seqq.*, 254, 257 n. 4.

Raesfeld, Bernard von (Bishop of Münster), 228.

Ragazzoni, Girolamo (Bishop of Famagosta), 284, 362.

Raverta, Ottaviano (Bishop of Terracina, nuncio to Spain), 134, 140, 164, 182, 187, 203, 252 *seq.*

Rebiba, Scipione, Cardinal, 14, 24 n. 2, 32, 60 n. 1, 161, 174, 219.

Requesens, Luis de (Spanish envoy in Rome), 106 n. 4, 118, 328, 361.

Rettinger (Bishop of Lavant), 296.

Reumano, Cardinal, 14, 23 *seq.*, 40, 46 *seq.*, 51.

Ribera (S. J.), 117, 118.

Ricasoli, G. B.) Florentine ambassador in Rome), 90 n. 4, 91 n. 3, 145, 150 n. 1, 393.

Riccardo (Abbot of Vercelli), 296.

Ricci, Cardinal, 6 n. 5, 14, 24 n. 2, 174.
Richardot (Bishop of Arras), 355
Rossi, G. A. (Milanese artist), 84 n. 1.
Rovere, Guilio della, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 14, 24 n. 2, 99 n. 4, 101.
Rovere, Guidobaldo (Duke of Urbino), 37, 69, 99 *seq.*
Rovere, Virginia della (wife of Federigo Borromeo), 99 *seq.*
Ruggieri, Fulgenzio, 225 n. 3.
Ruini, Carlo (preceptor to Gian Angelo de' Medici, later Pius IV.), 69.

SAINT-ANDRÉ, Marshal, 329.
Sala, Antonio and Aristide, 97 n., 111 n. 2.
Salviati, Bernardo, Cardinal, 163.
Sanfelice, Gian Tommaso (Bishop of La Cava), 246, 293.
Sangro [Sanguine], Fabrizio di (conclavist of Card. C. Carafa), 59, 133 n. 3, 134 n. 4, 140.
Santa Croce, Prospero, Cardinal (Bishop of Cisamus), 164 *seq.*, 195, 198, 203 *seq.*, 210, 251, 313 n. 2.
Santa Fiora, *see* Sforza.
Saraceni, Cardinal, 7, 14, 24 n. 2, 32, 50, 78, 128, 147, 174 n., 178 n. 1, 207, 211.
Sauli, Alessandro St. (Bishop of Aleria), 378.
Saurolo, Scipione, 111 n. 2.
Savelli, Cardinal, 14, 24 n. 1, 51, 128, 166.
Sbardalato, Andreas (Bishop of Knin), *see* Dudith.
Scalaleone, Felice (advocate of Card. C. Carafa), 155.
Schlegel, Theodore (Abbot), 70.
Schöneich, Kaspar von (Imperial comissary), 235.
Schutzbar, Wolfgang (Grand Master of the Teutonic Order), 238.
Scotti, Cardinal (of Trani), 12, 14, 24 n. 2.
Sebastian (King of Portugal), 251 *seq.*, 357.
Seld, Sigmund (Vice-chancellor of Ferdinand I.), 189, 286 n. 1, 308, 319, 323.
Serbelloni, Family of the, 80 n. 2, 104.
Serbelloni, Cecilia (mother of Pius IV.), 66 *seq.*
Serbelloni, Fabrizio (nephew of Pius IV.), 101.
Serbelloni, Gabrio (nephew of Pius IV., commander of the Papal guard), 101 *seq.*; 142 n. 2, 144.
Serbelloni, Gian Antonio, Cardinal, 98.
Serbelloni, Gian Battista (Bishop of Cassano, castellan of Sant' Angelo), 96 n. 2, 101.
Serbelloni, Gian Pietro (uncle to Pius IV.), 96.
Seripando, Girolamo, Cardinal (general of the Augustinian Hermits), 122 n. 1, 162, 202, 208 n. 2, 243, 244 *seqq.*, 252, 264, 273 *seq.*, 280 *seq.*, 285, 306, 311, 316.
Sermoneta, Cardinal, 14, 16 n. 2, 22, 24 n. 2.
Serristori, 255 n. 1, 362 n. 2.
Sesso, Oliviero (envoy of Card. C. Carafa to Spain), 134.
Sfondrato, Niccolò (Bishop of Cremona, later Pope Gregory XIV.), 252 n. 1.
Sforza, Francesco (Duke of Milan), 68, 70 *seqq.*
Sforza, Guido Ascanio, Cardinal (of Santa Fiora), 4, 14, 16, 21 *seqq.*, 27 *seqq.*, 33 *seqq.*, 48 *seqq.*, 57, 60 *seqq.*, 128, 130, 135, 140, 212.
Sforza, Maximilian (Duke of Milan), 67.
Sigismund Augustus (King of Poland), 251, 357.

Sigismund of Brandenburg (Archbishop of Magdeburg), 227.
Simoncelli, Cardinal, 6 n. 4, 7 n. 1, 14, 24 n. 2.
Simonetta, Lodovico, Cardinal, 162, 244 *seqq.*, 254, 258–261, 264, 269 n. 1, 272, 279 *seq.*, 285, 291 *seq.*, 305, 311, 316, 348, 361.
Singmoser (Imperial councillor), 323.
Sittard, Matthias (theologian), 319.
Sixtus IV., Pope, 177.
Soranzo, Giacomo (Venetian ambassador in Rome), 122 n. 1.
Soranzo, Girolamo (Venetian ambassador in Rome), 87, 89, 91, 101 n. 3, 109, 121, 123, 129.
Spina, Aurelio (chamberlain of Card. C. Borromeo), 143.
Staphylus, Frederick [Stafilo], 286 n. 1.
Stendardi, Matteo, 144.
Strozzi, Cardinal, 7 n. 1, 10 n. 2, 14, 21, 24 n. 2.
Strozzi, Giovanni (Florentine envoy to Trent), 271.

Taddeo Perugino, Fra, 13 n. 3.
Taro, Pirro (Conservator of Rome), 5.
Tarreghetti, Giacomo (Mantuan ambassador), 362 n. 2.
Tendilla, Count of (Spanish ambassador in Rome), 140 *seq.*, 145, 150 n. 1, 164, 192.
Teodolo, Hieron. (Bishop of Cadiz), 304.
Thiene, Count (Italian protestant), 239.
Thun, Sigmund von (envoy of Ferdinand I. to the Council of Trent), 252 n. 2, 257, 266, 289.
Thurm, Francis von (envoy of Ferdinand I. to Rome), 2 n., 11, 24 n. 2, 30, 44, 53 n. 1, 124, 180, 183.
Timoteo da Perugia (O.P.), 170 n.
Toledo, Antonio de (Spanish envoy to France), 198 *seq.*, 202.
Tonina, Francesco (Mantuan ambassador in Rome), 86, 100 n. 3, 115 n. 2, 156 *seq.*, 243 n. 4, 259 n. 3, 402 *seq.*, 406, 409, 411–414.
Toralto, Gian Antonio (kinsman to the Duchess Violante d'Alife), 137.
Torres, Luys de (notary), 147.
Tournon, Cardinal, 7 n. 1, 9, 13, 20 *seqq.*, 24 n. 2, 33, 46, 50, 61, 128, 199 *seq.*, 214.
Truchsess, Otto (Bishop of Augsburg), Cardinal, 7 n. 1, 14, 24 n. 2, 30, 32 *seq.*, 55, 102, 146, 211 n. 1, 340.
Turibio of Lima, St., 378.

Urbino, Cardinal, 147.
Urbino (secretary to Card. C. Carafa), 144.

Vacca, Antonio, 184.
Valiero, Agostino (Bishop of Verona), Cardinal, 96 n. 3.
Vanzi, Sebastian (Bishop of Orvisto), 341.
Varano, Guilia (Duchess of Urbino), 99.
Vargas, Francisco de (Spanish envoy in Rome), 11, 25 *seqq.*, 33 *seqq.*, 41, 44 *seqq.*, 51 *seqq.*, 56 *seq.*, 63 *seq.*, 133, 140 *seq.*, 145, 149 *seq.*, 164 *seq.*, 175, 181 *seqq.*, 187, 192 *seq.*, 202, 204, 243, 275, 277 *seq.*, 328, 330.
Veit von Würzburg (Bishop of Bamberg), 237.
Vendôme, Cardinal, *see* Bourbon, Charles de,
Vergerio (apostate), 239.
Verme, Taddea del (2nd wife of Giberto Borromeo), 113 n. 2.

Violante d'Alife, *see* Alife.
Visconti, Carlo (Bishop of Ventimiglia), Cardinal, 292, 294, 297.
Vitelli, Cardinal, 14, 20, 23 *seq.*, 49 n., 54 *seq.*, 57 *seqq.*, 61, 144.
Volpi, Giovan Antonio (Bishop of Como, nuncio), 125, 240.

William, Duke of Cleves Juliers, 231 *seq.*
William, Duke of Mantua, *see* Gonzaga.
Wirsberg, Frederick of (Bishop of Würzburg), 237.

Zambeccaro (Bishop of Sulmona), 362.
Zanchi, Girolamo (Italian protestant), 239.

PLEASE RETURN TO
SOMERVILLE COLLEGE,
OXFORD.

KW-182-334